



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

26 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVI No. 59B**

**8:00 p.m. Thursday, June 8, 1978**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 8, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

## SUPPLY — LABOUR

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Lady and gentlemen, we have a quorum. To the members of the committee that were present this afternoon, you will recall that the Minister of Labour gave out some information and material in a printed form to the Member for Kildonan. I'm holding it in front of me and, as you can see, it's many pages in thickness. At the time this afternoon, I suggested rather than having the Minister of Labour's department reproduce this for every member of the Legislature, that perhaps we could have it printed into Hansard. The Clerk tells me that it is just about as difficult, and likely just as expensive, to have it printed into the Hansard form. So, what we have suggested perhaps what we do is have three or four sets so that there are two or three for each caucus and that should look after the interests of all members. Is that satisfactory? (Agreed)

I also notice left at my desk was the Laugh of the Day cartoon where a person is standing up before a committee and it reads, "Since this committee isn't working out, I am appointing a committee to find out why." I was just wondering if, after Tuesday evening's hassle, if that is the general consensus of our poor committee, that we need a subcommittee to find out why we're not making progress.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, on that very point, I would suggest to you that that might be a project that the department could undertake and advise the Minister on.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right. When we broke at 4:30 for Private Members' Hour, the Member for Churchill was in the throws of asking the Minister a few questions and I don't see the Member for Churchill present. I was under the impression that we were almost ready to pass the other Other Expenditures under (b)(2) and get on to the research aspect.

The Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Yes, the Member for Churchill will be a bit late because he has another commitment but he'll be here later on. He was asking questions about apprenticeship. I think we had a consultant advising the department on apprenticeship that seemed to have been a full-time position and now it seems to be reduced to a per diem part-time type of consulting service and I think he was asking for an explanation as to why. Now perhaps the explanation was given but I wasn't here to hear it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** He wasn't hired on a full-time. He is a full-time professor at the University. He was only hired on a consulting basis.

**MR. PARASIUK:** So the contract was what? — changed from a . . . You said it was a part-time contract before to a per diem now?

**MRS. PRICE:** He was paid on an annual rate but only used in a consulting manner and he was also chairman of the Apprenticeship Board.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can we pass (b)(2)? (b)(2)—pass; 1.(c) Research, Salaries — \$123,600 — the Member for Logan, Kildonan, then Transcona.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Minister explain the reduction in the appropriation here under (1) Salaries? It was \$165,200 last year; I understand it was 12 staff man years. Approximately how many staff man years have we got this year?

**MRS. PRICE:** There's a vacancy due to the death of one Mr. Shepherd and that reduction is the difference in his salary.

**MR. JENKINS:** One vacancy. So we have 11 staff man years?

**MRS. PRICE:** We have — in research?

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes.

**MRS. PRICE:** We have 6 man years.

**MR. JENKINS:** Six staff man years.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. JENKINS:** What did we have last year?

**MRS. PRICE:** Seven.

**MR. JENKINS:** Seven. So there is no salary in this year's appropriations?

**MRS. PRICE:** No.

**MR. JENKINS:** So then we have no vacancies.

**MRS. PRICE:** Right. We don't intend to fill it at this time.

**MR. JENKINS:** It's not intended to be filled.

**MRS. PRICE:** Right. We still regard it as a vacant position but we're not intending on filling it at this time.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, that leads to a bit of confusion. We found in (b)(1) that we had . . . The Minister under questioning said that there was an appropriation for 24, with two vacancies, and 24 salaries involved. Are we here speaking now of six salaries involved or seven salaries, under the \$123,600.00?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes. We have six funded but there was seven last year before the death of Mr. Shepherd. So we're just . . .

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, then there are no vacancies now, because there's no appropriation for it, so then six staff man years is the present complement with no vacancy?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister can explain the kind of research that's being done, and since we've cut back in the amount of Research by cutting one SMY back, what area is going to be eliminated in respect to Research?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we're not anticipating any cutback in Research, we're just putting the existing people to more advantageous use.

**MR. FOX:** Well, can the Minister explain what is more advantageous? What does a researcher do that would improve his skill from yesterday to today?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I have the Assistant Director here, the Acting Director or Director now, and he is quite satisfied with the number of people that are in the department, and that there isn't any less research being carried out. The research is primarily to provide advice and information to the

Thursday, June 8, 1978

Minister and senior officials, and some support for various program areas of the department, and we find that it is working quite well with one man less.

**MR. FOX:** Could we get some indication of the kind of areas that the research has been done in?

**MRS. PRICE:** Anything to do with labour relations and giving advice to the various boards and committees, assisting them in research and also reviewing legislation, is primarily their work.

**MR. FOX:** Well, could the Minister be a little more specific? I think she's saying generally, we understand research is looking at things and studying them, but . . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we collect all the annual collective agreements and study those.

**MR. FOX:** And the Minister believes at the present time with the same number of contracts that she should be able to do it with less staff?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, that's how the department feels. As I say, I have the director right here now and he's quite satisfied that his department operates efficiently and as well as it could.

**MR. FOX:** Well, I'm not worried whether the director of Research is satisfied; I want to hear the Minister tell us whether she is satisfied.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I'm satisfied. I take his . . .

**MR. FOX:** . . . Well, could I complete it first? . . . that she's satisfied that the same amount or the same quality of work will be done in respect to research the labour field, and, of course, the kind of specific areas that were touched on last year and whether the same kind of work will be done this year, or whether it will be less work because she feels it isn't necessary.

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't see any lessening of service from that department and I am quite satisfied that the department is running satisfactorily.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Shepherd was the director I believe last year.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. FOX:** And I understood that he did a very good job, in fact, I had personal involvement with him many years ago and, of course, also recently before he passed away. Do you feel now that he didn't do a good enough job of organizing and that's why we can cut back by one person?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I wouldn't say that for a moment. I've heard nothing but good reports about him, but we also have the man that was working with him is doing that particular work and he is also an extremely competent individual.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, usually when you develop the budget for a branch, you do have a breakdown of ongoing activities that are being undertaken by the group and you'd also have a list of research projects that the branch is involved in and then you would also have those that are proposed for the upcoming year. Now, since this is the part of the department that will be, in a sense, looking at the some of the possible new areas of activity for the department, can the Minister tell us what new projects, research projects, the Research Branch has on its agenda for the coming year?

**MRS. PRICE:** The activities of the division include assisting in the development of legislation and regulations; compiling and analyzing information for policy formulation and program evaluation; providing secretarial and research assistance to the Labour-Management Review Committee, the Minimum Wage Board and other departmental boards and committees; meeting requests for information from the public, other governmental departments or agencies and universities;

on an interdepartmental basis in the development and evaluation of manpower policies and programs; participating in the work and activities of intergovernmental labour research committees and other industrial relations associations; and compiling annual reports for the department.

**MR. PARASIUK:** That reads like a general statement out of the Annual Report. I don't think that that's probably the operating budget of the department or that's not the breakdown that the Minister received from the department when she was going over these Estimates. She doesn't have to provide them to us and that's fair enough. But with respect to some of the areas of activity that the Minister indicated, she says they are going to provide support to the Minimum Wage Board. Well, we've heard that the Minimum Wage Board isn't meeting. She said that they provide support to a number of other boards and the Minister has said that a number of those aren't meeting, so I'm wondering whether in fact that particular area of activity requires any people whatsoever.

Secondly, she indicated that this branch of the department provides research activity for the government with respect to its manpower thrust. I note that the Manpower and Employment Cabinet Subcommittee has been abolished. The type of work that people in this branch used to do in relation to that committee probably is no longer being done, so it strikes me that that is somewhat obsolete as well. So, I'm wondering in fact whether this particular branch has anything left to do. That's why I'm surprised that the Minister isn't able to indicate what new topics of research this particular branch is undertaking, because some of the ones that it supposedly is undertaking are no longer being done by the branch. So it certainly should have some slack capacity to take on some new research activities, or if it doesn't have any research activities to do of a new type, perhaps this appropriation is too high as it is right now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't say that there were boards not meeting. The Minimum Wage Board met last July. They meet once a year, July hasn't rolled around yet. The Labour Management Review Committee met in December and they met once a year, so that isn't any lessening of their meeting either, so I don't agree with the Member for Transcona that the boards aren't meeting.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c) (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Brandon East, then the Member for St. George.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, well I'd like to find out . . . I listened to the Minister read off the activities of the division as listed in the Annual Report for the year 1977, which is very comprehensive, but more specifically could she not give the members of the committee an indication of just what is that division now doing? What are the major projects that they're engaged in? This is a very comprehensive list and it's very all-encompassing and I think we should be given some idea as to what these people are doing for the money that we are about to vote for them.

**MRS. PRICE:** A research department is analyzing the collective agreements, they are reviewing all the legislation, they work preparing our annual reports, they work preparing our budget and it's exactly the same as it has been in recent years, for many years.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the outline of activities, which I agree are all-encompassing and probably are very appropriate for research grants of the Department of Labour, but when the Minister says assisting in the development of legislation and regulations, precisely what legislation are they working on? What legislation is being developed?

**MRS. PRICE:** We are reviewing all the legislation. We've been reviewing the Workplace Safety Act very carefully. Safety legislation is relatively new legislation, is the Minister indicating by a review of that legislation that she sees deficiencies in it, or would she like to have it changed in some material way?

**MRS. PRICE:** We are reviewing the regulations in that particular Act at this time.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, we'll be discussing Workplace Health and Safety and other items related to that eventually, but is it with regard to by any chance, improving the regulations pertaining to anhydrous ammonia?

**MRS. PRICE:** That's one of them.

**MR. EVANS:** What about the area of manpower policies? You noted that the division participated

on an interdepartmental basis in the development and evaluation of manpower policies and programs. Could the Minister elaborate on that? Precisely and exactly, what evaluation of manpower policies and programs is now under way?

**MRS. PRICE:** The Research Department participates in the Manpower Needs Committee and as I said, on all the different committees and boards' they work along with them. It's exactly the same as has been under your time.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, while the objectives may be the same, that is the evaluation of manpower policies, nevertheless it would seem to me that this is an ongoing business, it's an ongoing type of work. What I would like to know is, just precisely, is there some development of a new manpower policy? Is there any developments on manpower needs that the Minister can advise us of? While the format may be the same and the objectives may be the same, it seems to me the content does change from time to time, whether it's a different government or the same government. The content of this type of research would change as we have changing labour conditions, changing employment conditions, changing economic situations.

It seemed to me that one of the pieces of work that this Research Division would be engaged in, under this particular heading, is to just attempt to get some idea as to how widespread unemployment is. We get a lot of general information from the labour force survey, but in order to help formulate manpower policies and evaluate manpower policies, I would think that the division would want to look at the current unemployment situation as it affects different kinds of occupations, different trades, men, women, different age groups. I would think it would like to do some type of forecasting respecting employment opportunities for people in the future, particularly as a member of the Manpower Needs Committee of government, whereby recommendations are made for allocation of moneys to the community colleges, to ensure that people are being trained for those occupations which are in the greatest demand and perhaps should not be trained for those occupations which are in decline.

So, I've given the Minister some idea of what I think are some types of projects that the division would work on under this category. So, I wondered if she could now enlighten us in this particular area, just very specifically what is being worked on in this area.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, Manpower comes under the Continuing Education Department, not under the Department of Labour. The only training programs the Department of Labour has is the apprenticeship training. That is the only one that we are responsible for and we are not responsible for the forecasting or checking on the unemployment either.

**MR. EVANS:** You are saying, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is telling us that we have a Department of Labour, a Research Division, which has I'm sure some very competent people, not in any way engaged in forecasting manpower needs? I'm sure that that must be the case, it must be the case that they should be involved in some way because they're on the committee and even though it may not be the direct responsibility of the Minister as she interprets her responsibility, nevertheless it would seem to me that as Minister of Labour, she would want to have her staff participate in this and be very concerned herself about what work opportunities there were for Manitobans.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have no more answer to give other than that, that the bulk of the Manpower is through the Continuing Education. The only connection that we have is with the apprenticeship training requirements. That's what we have through our Manpower Needs as I mentioned.

**MR. EVANS:** So, we're being told then, Mr. Chairman, by the Minister that the Research Division of the Department of Labour has no Estimates, no idea of what's going to happen, let's say in the next three months, the next six months, what the trends are in the demand for labour in Manitoba? Is that what we are being told?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm advised that the Research Department was never involved in that in the past, and it's not involved in it now.

**MR. EVANS:** Yet it says, Mr. Chairman, that the activities of the division include, and I'm quoting from Page 34 of the Annual Report, "Participation on an interdepartmental basis in the development and evaluation of manpower policies and programs." So I would submit, Mr. Chairman, if the research staff participate, surely they're not just sitting there observing, surely participation means input. It means that this research staff is providing some data, providing some views, providing some analyses on manpower policies, and if that's the case, just what input are they putting? Otherwise this should be scratched from the list of activities. If they are participating it means hopefully participating in

an active positive way.

**MRS. PRICE:** As I mentioned, they are acting through participation through the Manpower Needs Committee, that is their only participation with regard to manpower.

**MR. EVANS:** The Minister has not received any estimates of manpower demand, let's say for the next period of time, for the balance of 1977, because this is work done in connection with the Manpower Needs Committee. I'm saying to the Minister, she may not have heard me — if they are participating in a meaningful way, surely to goodness they must have something to say about manpower policies. I mean otherwise why go to these meetings? Why be a member of that committee? The report says that they participate to evaluate manpower policies, so I'm suggesting that they must have something to say, some input, some information for the Minister, and therefore this committee on manpower demand and what kind of policy should be forthcoming?

**MRS. PRICE:** The Manpower Needs Committee gives their annual review. They are under it right now, and they give an annual report, but the results of the report are not completed as yet.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, would the Minister undertake to make a copy available to the members of the committee when it's completed?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I will.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you. The other item here, compiling and analyzing information for policy formulation and program evaluation, can the Minister advise if there's any new policies now being formulated in the department?

**MRS. PRICE:** For policy formulation, it's an ongoing thing formalizing new policies in any department and it's what they do for our department.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, is the Minister giving the Research Division any particular direction? Being a relatively new Minister with the new government and a new mandate, I think it's quite legitimate for the Minister to give direction through her Deputy to the Research Division with regard to policy formulation research. It's quite legitimate and I think it would be interesting to know whether the Minister herself has given any new guidelines and has enunciated any new priorities in this as the Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, as I mentioned, right now we are very actively engaged in looking over The Workplace Safety Act and the Research Department is working with me in giving me advice on it.

**MR. EVANS:** The Minister, Mr. Chairman, the Minister means The Workplace Safety and Health

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. EVANS:** . . . legislation. In that respect, does this division engage in the technical aspects of it because just to take the anhydrous ammonia, or take the lead poisoning regardless, it seems to me that you get into very technical area beyond economics and into the area of chemistry, engineering, biology and many other fields and, therefore, does this Research Division get into that area, or does it confine itself to the economics of the . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** They confine themselves to the economics. The expertise in anhydrous ammonia and products of that nature comes under the mechanical engineering and the people that are experts in that.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, how can the division review? In analyzing information for policy formulation, would they not be handicapped in advising the Minister on policy formulation in say The Workplace Health and Safety Act?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, to start with, there are certain portions of the Workplace Safety that do not come under discussions of anhydrous ammonia or any of these other complicated matters pertaining to the occupational health and they spend the bulk of their time in the comparative analysis of legislation, making comparisons with other jurisdictions, and they bring it forth to our people from

the Mechanical Engineering.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, is the division still composed of a director, four research analysts, a secretary and one clerical staff?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, we have the Acting Director, three research analysts, one research assistant and a clerk typist.

**MR. EVANS:** What is their training, can the Minister indicate what type of training they have, what background, do they have Commerce degrees or Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Ph.Ds, or generally is there professional training?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well they're all university graduates with the exception of the clerk typist.

**MR. EVANS:** In what field?

**MRS. PRICE:** There's economic, science, commerce, and I don't know what the other is. These are people that have been in the department for a number of years.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, apart from the Manpower Needs Committee, does the division not engage in any type of economic forecasting at all particularly with regard to manpower, particularly with regard to employment opportunities? Am I being advised that in no way is the Research Division involved in that but more so as something of an in-house research arm for the various other branches of the department, say pertaining to labour relations or pertaining to writing of regulations, etc.? Is it not in any way involved, as I said, in the manpower demand side and forecasting economic activity with regard to employment opportunities?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, they're actively involved in the apprenticeship training which I said is the primary and the only training that comes under the Department of Labour.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, has the Research Division conducted any work with regard to the minimum wage and if so, what type of research work does it do there?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, they participated in the studies under your government in 1972 and 1973 or 1974, I can't remember which it is.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, does the division today do any research with regard to the minimum wage situation in Manitoba?

**MRS. PRICE:** Do they which?

**MR. EVANS:** Do they do any research respecting minimum wages in Manitoba and all the ramifications thereof?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, as I say they participated in the past with research on the Minimum Wage Board.

**MR. EVANS:** But is there any research going on today, Mr. Chairman, in that area of minimum wage?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George . . . or, is the Member for Brandon East . . .

**MR. EVANS:** I don't think I received an answer on that.

**MRS. PRICE:** I've answered.

**MR. EVANS:** I'm sorry, I didn't hear her reply.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have answered repeatedly the same question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, there's nothing to prevent the Minister from banking the

**MR. EVANS:** No, not at all but I . . .

**MR. CRAIK:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, in that point then if that's the case, then let the Minister bank the questions.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, on that point, it was my understanding that she was going to respond now, but if she doesn't wish to respond I suppose that's fair game, but I was under the impression that she was going to give us an answer and I was just waiting to give her a moment to get that information, but if she isn't prepared to answer, or hasn't got an answer, well, as we all know, the Ministers do not have to provide information and they don't have to answer, but I thought that this was an answer she was about to come forth with, but if that isn't the case we can leave it at that, but it would seem to me that that is one area that the . . .

**MR. p CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, on a ooint of rder, it was not a question of leaving the item. If the item was being left, then that's another item, but the Minister was not leaving the item, she was simply waiting for the information which is entirely in order and which does not mean she's not coming back to the question asked by the member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Meer for Brandon East, as you know from previous committee meetings, I try to keep a list of interested speakers and I do have four on the list now including yourself, and I assumed that the Minister was either going to bank the question, or didn't have an answer for it, and that you were through questioning and that's why I was going to go on to the Member for St. George. The Member for Kildonan.<sup>3</sup>

**MR. FOX:** On that point of order' Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept the Minister banking questions but our problem is that if we get no indication we do not know whether we will get an answer. And if the Minister would say, well, she doesn't have the answer at the present time but will give it in a little while, then we are prepared to go on and wait for the banked answers. But if there is no indication, then we have to wait to see whether we are going to, or repeat the question. So I think, on a procedural point, we should get an indication from the Minister one way or another.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, again on the point of order, the usual practice in the House on examination of Estimates is that the Minister may use her discretion as to whether she gets into a rapid fire question and answer exchange, or whether in fact she may wish to wait for information from the department in order to answer a question. It's not a question of asking for the concurrence of the opposition as to whether she answers in a process of cross-examination, which is essentially what this appears to be boiling down to, or whether or not she intends to answer it in due course as she prepares her answer. I think that she has the right, Mr. Chairman, without asking for the concurrence, as suggested by the Member for Kildonan, that she has to answer it immediately and only cannot do so with the concurrence of a member of the opposition.

So if the Minister of Labour wishes to wait for information from her department while she is on the same item — and there has been no suggestion she is moving off the item — then to do otherwise is to tell the Minister of Labour, by the members of the opposition, "You must answer now, and you must not answer at any other time during this particular item."

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. There has been no attempt by the opposition here to force the Minister to do one thing or the other. We have asked the Minister and, in the main, she has been giving us the answers right away. What the Honourable Member for Kildonan is saying, this is the procedure that we have been going along. We have had no problem now until the Member for Riel comes in and starts to . . .

**MR. CRAIK:** Again, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman . . .

**MR. JENKINS:** Just a moment, I still have the floor until the Chairman recognizes you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Logan.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, is the member on a point of order?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, the Member for Logan is recognized.

**MR. JENKINS:** I am on the same point of order that you were speaking to. Now, you can have it either way you want. We don't care which way you want to do it, as long as we get an indication from the Minister. The Minister is doing fine. She is answering the questions in her own fashion. I don't think you need to come here and protect her.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. This was started by the Minister was waiting on information and the Chairman wished to move on to another member. The Member for Brandon East interceded to disallow her from moving on, or the Chairman from moving on to another participant on the same item in the debate.

The point I am trying to make is that it is within the power of the Chairman or the Minister to move on under the same item and, if she so desires, to come back to answer a previous question by a former member without moving off the item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I don't know where the Minister of Finance was but we were going along in a certain fashion and I just assumed that we were going to get an answer. And if the Minister doesn't want to answer, that's fine. I'm not objecting; I know what the rules are. But we were going along this way and I was just waiting for an answer and one wasn't forthcoming and this is why I interjected when the Chairman indicated he was going to go on to another member. I can come back; I am quite willing and happy to wait for others to ask questions and I can ask some questions later. But I want it very clear, Mr. Chairman, it was very clear that there was sort of a procedure which we were developing. We can use many different procedures and that seemed to be the one that the Minister was willing and ready to go along with. You can use any procedure you like. I am not trying to be unreasonable and I resent any inference or suggestion by the Minister of Finance that I was trying to be unreasonable or trying to dictate to the Chairman or to the Minister of Labour.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right, can we backtrack to the Member for Brandon East and get him to repeat his last question. By now I have forgotten what it is; I'm sure the Minister has. But I might say that I haven't seen this Minister, and I would agree with the Member for Logan, she is doing her best to answer each and every question. But she, like other Ministers, doesn't have all the answers at her fingertips and occasionally she has to go to her staff people. But would the Member for Brandon East repeat his last question because I believe it has been forgotten.

**MR. EVANS:** My last question related to research pertaining to the minimum wage in Manitoba. The Minister did previously indicate that the Research Division had done work in the past for the Minimum Wage Board. My question was: Is that division currently engaged in research pertaining to the minimum wage in Manitoba and, if so, what is the nature of that research?

**MRS. PRICE:** They have an ongoing analysis of the economic statistics related to the question of minimum wages, and that is an ongoing procedure in that department. Then they provide this to the administration.

**MR. EVANS:** Fine. I will pass now for some other member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George is next on my list. Is he absent from the committee at the present time? Then the next one is the Member for Kildonan, followed by the Member for St. Johns. The Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I thought that I had finished with Research because I had gotten a certain kind of answers from the Minister. They weren't precisely what I was asking for, but in view of the fact that she keeps continually referring to Research being involved in Workplace Safety and Health, and I understand by looking at this that there is research as well under Section 79, does that mean that there is an overlapping between the Administrative Research doing research under Workplace and Safety, as well?

And further, in respect to the other areas of Research — that is to follow up on what the Member

for Brandon East said — how much research is being done into the apprenticeship areas in order to make sure we set policy in respect of apprenticeships in the areas where we do need jobs, and we eliminate the apprenticeships where industries are indicating we are not going to need people trained in that particular area?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, in the Workplace Safety Research, that pertains to technical research and it is a co-ordinated research between the Workplace Safety and the Research Department.

**MR. FOX:** Can the Minister answer my second question in respect to apprenticeship?

**MRS. PRICE:** What was that? Could you repeat it, please?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Could the Member for Kildonan repeat the second part of the question, please?

**MR. FOX:** Yes. We have to set policy. The government probably has to set policy in respect to how much apprenticeship training is going to be done in any particular area.

Now, how much research is being done in respect to those kind of areas that may become obsolescent and what are the specifics that are being done now?

**MRS. PRICE:** They are not becoming obsolescent; they are growing every year in the apprenticeship training. This year we have some 2,800 apprentices taking the courses.

**MR. FOX:** I can appreciate 2,800 people taking courses but if they are taking courses where eventually they won't have any jobs, what is the purpose of doing this kind of training? I would hope that Research would be delving into that and indicating which areas of industry we should be creating apprenticeships and which ones we should be eliminating apprenticeships. Is that being done?

**MRS. PRICE:** There is a continuing annual review takes place by the Research Department with regard to the apprenticeship training. You must realize that it's all on a volunteer basis. They take courses that they would like to take and work for whoever they want to. So that we have no control over that.

**MR. FOX:** Would not the Research Department point out that even if people desire to take training, that they would have no future in that particular area? Would not the Minister's department be creating a policy and indicating we will not spend money involved in training people into areas where they may become obsolescent before they get started?

**MRS. PRICE:** I think that's a very negative attitude to be looking at. We are looking at an upsurge in the economy in this province, not from a black point of view.

**MR. FOX:** Possibly I'm not phrasing the question properly. Would there be any point in creating apprenticeships in boilermakers, when we are no longer having steam engines? I don't know what other kind of analogy I can give the Minister. Is the Research Department doing something in respect to making certain that we are training people into the right areas?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes. The director of the apprenticeship division keeps a close eye on that with regard to what are the most popular programs to be studied and keeps abreast of it in that manner, and he's the one that's most suitable to do it.

**MR. FOX:** Is it a policy of the department to indicate that even if it's popular that some people shouldn't be going into those areas, that we should cut down the numbers?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I think we leave that to the expertise of the director of that division.

**MR. FOX:** But it is a policy that would be announced if there were some areas that were becoming obsolete?

**MRS. PRICE:** If there were some areas that he considered would be obsolete, we wouldn't promote that particular program.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I've been having difficulty appreciating the responsibility of this Research Branch in General Administration. I've just heard the Minister refer to the research people as being involved in deciding what courses should be made available in apprenticeship training as part of the manpower training program, and then she said the director of the apprenticeship program determines which are the courses that should be taught based on popularity apparently. What role does the Research Department play in advising the Minister in this respect, in regard to the apprenticeship program?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, the Research Department does the research to help the director of the apprenticeship division. They co-ordinate their research and his expertise to see what programs should be implemented the following year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister could as an example, using this apprenticeship program as an example, indicate just what kind of research is done. What are the research tools that are used? What is the information that the Research Department uses in order to be able to advise the director of research in this respect?

**MRS. PRICE:** Exactly the same tools that have been used for the past eight or ten years. Exactly the same. The department has not changed its format in any shape or form.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that I was looking for reassurance that there was no change, I'm not even sure that what has been done for the eight or ten last years is particularly useful. I would like to know from the Minister what tools are being used? What tools will be used next year? There is a budgetary item of \$135,000 for this program. I would like to know what tools they are. I'm not interested particularly in history, I'd like to know what next year has in store.

**MRS. PRICE:** I would imagine in a research department is basically the same thing. They draw their statistics from Statistics Canada, from different types of publications that are put out, and they take the best of all of them, and bring them in, and they sit down and discuss it with the director of the apprenticeship program and I think this is just a normal format that would take place in any departments of research.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So the Minister is indicating that they make use of Statistics Canada information and magazines apparently in this field?

**MRS. PRICE:** Different journals, different publications.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Different publications like — I don't know what publications would have that kind of information, I would be interested to know.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well I mentioned earlier too they compare other jurisdictions, what they are doing. They get the different Acts from the different provinces and make comparisons. When I was here on Tuesday I gave you numerous statistics that had come from different provinces with regard to the minimum wage. Those are all compiled by the Research Department.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, we were talking about the apprenticeship program.

**MRS. PRICE:** It's the same format.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'm not sure what that has to do with Statutes from various provinces. Is it the Annual Reports of other Departments of Labour in other jurisdictions that the Minister is referring to? Because I don't quite understand in relation to the apprenticeship program just what Statutes have to do with that. I understand about Statistics Canada . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't mention the word Statutes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The comparative Statutes from different provinces, I'm not even sure what relationship that has to do with research generally. I now understand Statistics Canada as having information, I'm not even sure that the information comes from Statistics Canada on a provincial basis. Does Manitoba have its own information that makes it available for the Research Department?

i would be interested in that.

And at the same time, may I ask who the director is, who determines the research that is being carried on, let's say next week, by this branch?

**MRS. PRICE:** The director of the apprenticeship is Mr. Jack Redhead.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'm sorry, I meant the director of the Research Branch, that we're dealing with, Item 1.(c) Salaries, who is the director?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Jim Wood.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And has he been with the department for many years as the Minister indicated?

**MRS. PRICE:** About eight years I think it is.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Does he determine the program of research or does the Minister do that, or the Deputy Minister? —(Interjection)— Somebody in the background, Mr. Chairman.

**MRS. PRICE:** He does it in consultation with other . . . —(Interjection)— I find it hard to believe all these questions that the member is asking me. Research departments are basically the same in any kind of company. It's been the same thing for many years here. The research is done in co-operation with each director of the different divisions that we have, that's what the research is for. They come forward with their findings, and they present it to the directors of the division, who then in turn come in to my office and give me their finished report.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, this Minister told us today that she participated in the firing of the Deputy Minister because she believed that he was not philosophically in accord with the Conservative Government. That was made clear today, and the Minister without Portfolio is now saying what she did not do. I would be happy to hear him correct her or correct me and I'll defer to him. Is there somebody on the list after me? I would be glad to defer to hear from the Minister without Portfolio if I don't lose the floor that way, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, I said, "No, she didn't." She said that she and the deputy did not agree philosophically and it got to a situation where they were hardly speaking by the end of the year and it was a bad situation. I didn't hear the word "Conservative philosophy" mentioned at all.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I did. I certainly did hear her say that he was asked whether he could work with the new government, the Conservative Government, and he said he could, but she later came to the conclusion that he couldn't, that he was — she didn't use the word "sabotage", but she described the fact that he withheld information from her, asked her to sign documents that she shouldn't have signed and didn't, and I'm satisfied that she indicated that he was fired because he was not in accord with the Conservative philosophy. Now, if the Minister without Portfolio does not agree that that's a reason for firing him, that's his problem. But, I want to know the extent to which the work of this Research Department that we are dealing with under Item 1.(c)(1) has its work determined for it by Mr. Wood, or by the Deputy Minister, or by the Minister, and I still don't have the answer although she's amazed to discover that I'm asking this, so I'm asking it.

**MRS. PRICE:** I just made a statement about it that Mr. Wood does his research and then it's in consultation with the directors of the different divisions, whatever they're pertaining to, and then in it comes to me.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know the extent to which and the nature of the research that is being done in determining whether or not the minimum wage should be altered. What statistics, what research is being done and has been done by that department to assist the Minister in making the decision not to proceed with an increase in minimum wage?

**MRS. PRICE:** I think, Mr. Chairman, that that will be given when I respond to the resolution by the Member for Logan on the minimum wage.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a right to not answer at all, but I am asking

the Minister now, the extent to which the people who are paid salaries of \$123,000 for this coming fiscal year under Item 1.(c)(1), are doing or have done research on the minimum wage which have assisted her in making the decision which she has announced, not to proceed with an increase in minimum wage?

**MRS. PRICE:** There have been studies done by the Research Department regarding the minimum wage and at this point I am prepared to give you the statistics . . . The last Minimum Wage Board met in July of 1977 and that was mentioned on Tuesday here, I have said that I will give a more thorough discussion on the minimum wage when I respond to the resolution by the Member for Logan.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I really wasn't asking for the results of the research, I want to know the nature of the research that has been done by that department which was given to her to assist her in arriving at a decision not to raise the minimum wage. I don't particularly . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** They have taken the different provinces, checked over the Consumer Price Index, the average weekly earnings, the rates in all the different provinces and they have compiled these figures and given them to me.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And is that what convinced the Minister and the Cabinet to make this decision in regard to minimum wage?

**MRS. PRICE:** Partly.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The reason I ask that, is that the Minimum Wage Board apparently met last July and I wanted to know whether this research branch worked with and for the Minimum Wage Board in their evaluation and their recommendations.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, they provided information to the Minimum Wage Board that met last July.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So that they worked then on loan, I don't mean on loan . . . by assignment in various aspects of the Labour Department.

**MRS. PRICE:** No.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I thought I was understanding you until I got that "no".

**MRS. PRICE:** You said they weren't on various assignments . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I said they work on assignment . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Oh work, I thought you said weren't. . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, work, work . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, they do.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(c)(1)—pass — the Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Getting back to the Research Department and its co-operation with the Director of Apprenticeship Training, does the Research Department check to see if there are, in various trades, shortages of trained qualified tradesmen and how many people should be channeled into say, apprenticeship training say for electricians, pipefitters, plumbers and various, and how does the Research Department work in determining how many the industry can absorb in each year? The Minister stated that it was a popularity contest more or less, some trades are much more glamorous than others and I wondered if that was the type of research, surely that isn't the type of research that's being carried on by the Research Department because if there are potentially say a hundred vacancies in a certain trade for the coming year, certainly you wouldn't take . . . Of the 2,800, I think that she stated that in the apprenticeship program this year, we wouldn't take 1,500 and put them in if there was only potentially room for a hundred. Surely that's not the type of research that they're doing because the Minister stated it was mainly the one that

was most popular that people were going to. Surely it must be giving some guidance to the research director and to the potential apprenticeships that are going to be coming into the apprenticeship training program. I would like the Minister to give a bit of the background and whatnot that the Research Department does, and while she's at it, could she also give us the . . . She's given us the Acting Director, three Research Analysts, one Research Analyst Assistant, and one Sy, ecretar clerical. Could she give us the wage scales for the following positions as well?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, with regard to your first question, the Research Department, as I mentioned before, gets information from Statistics Canada and Canada Manpower and they work co-ordinated, work with the apprenticeship and with the information that they have received from Stats Canada and Canada Manpower, they can relate to and report to the director of that division, the different popular programs that should be encouraged. With regard to the second, as to the salaries, I'll have to . . . Somebody's just figuring them out.

**MR. JENKINS:** I thank the Minister for that answer. Also, do they not . . . I can understand they deal with Stats Canada and whatnot, but primarily and I'm not, don't let the Minister misunderstand me, I'm not opposed that if we train people here, potentially tradesmen here, that if they go elsewhere, I'm not opposed to that, but does the check that the Research Department goes into, do they check with the various trades in industry in the province and the trade unions that are I think also on the Advisory Committee? I mean surely some of that research must be done with these people too, because after all that would give you your local demand because what you're getting from Stats Canada, I imagine would be industry-wide across the county. Does the Research Department work with the Winnipeg Builders Exchange for an example for one and other employer groups and as I say the labour organizations that are involved also with that? Do they do any research, does that form part of the research work that the Director and his research analysts do as well?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, that's part of the work of the apprenticeship board, they keep in touch with the labour and management and relate their findings to the Director of the department.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, then the Director of Apprenticeship Training, he is the one that is in contact with the local scene, is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. JENKINS:** And then does he feed that information on to the Research Department and do they dovetail that together to make the recommendations that they would make to you as the Minister coming up with the amount of apprenticeship you are going to take in for the next year?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, they do, they work in co-operation with each other. I have . . .

**MR. JENKINS:** So there's two branches of research then being done, there's the research done on the national scale here by the Acting Director and his research staff, and then there's the research done by the Apprenticeship Board itself, and the two then are dovetailed together to make the estimates and what you will be taking in this year. I thank the Minister . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, and I have the salaries that you requested. The Director gets \$26,000, the Research Analysts, one of them gets \$24,500, one get's \$20,000, one \$14,500, Research Assistant \$15,000 and the clerical typist gets \$9,900.00.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Could I just review an answer that the Minister gave a few minutes ago when she was discussing the Research Branch's research into the minimum wage? I believe that she said that they had been monitoring Stats Canada statistics and had given the Minister figures on the minimum wage of CPI and I believe there was one other index or list that she mentioned.

**MRS. PRICE:** Consumer Price Index and the average weekly earnings and the rates in the other jurisdictions.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister when we were discussing minimum wage before had brought into the discussion and gave it as a one of her main reasons, the matter of

Thursday, June 8, 1978

unemployment and the unemployment rates in other provinces. Has the Research Branch given the Minister any advice or statistics on unemployment rates as they relate to the minimum wage?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes they have.

**MR. WALDING:** Did the Research Branch advise the Minister that Quebec's unemployment rate is the highest in Canada?

**MRS. PRICE:** The unemployment rate? It's the highest other than Prince Edward Island.

**MR. WALDING:** I wonder if the Minister would like to invite the Research Branch . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Or, Newfoundland I mean, I'm sorry.

**MR. WALDING:** Oh, that was my information too, Mr. Chairman' that Newfoundland's rate was the highest in the cotry. I found it rather difficult to relate the Minister's comparisons when she gave earlier on a justification for not raising the minimum wage that Quebec, which has the highest minimum wage, she said had the highest unemployment rate in the country where there seems to be a correlation but now she is saying that the highest rate is Newfoundland which has the lowest minimum wage, so there seems to be a correlation there in exactly the opposite direction. Now, would the Minister care to comment on this, and is she still of the same opinion that the two are directly comparable?

t04**MRS. PRICE:** I don't think we can make a comparison between Newfoundland and Quebec. I did say and I retracted the other day that I had thought that Quebec had the highest unemployment, I was relating to the rest of the provinces in Canada other than the Maritimes, but I don't think it's fair to make a comparison between Newfoundland and Quebec or the rest of the Canadian provinces.

**MR. WALDING:** I understood from the Minister's comments on Tuesday, Mr. Chairman, that the comparison was not between Quebec and any of the Maritime provinces, but it was an argument by the Minister and perhaps the main argument she gave to the committee of the relationship between the minimum wage and the unemployment rate. She gave as a justification for not raising it that if the minimum wage should be raised, that this would result in an increase in unemployment in that particular province. Now, has the Research Branch supplied the Minister with any statistics to show that there has been a direct cause and effect between the minimum wage and the resulting unemployment rises?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm informed by the Director of the Research that they are doing some comparisons between the unemployment rate and the minimum wage and it's not yet completed.

**MR. WALDING:** Is the Minister then telling us that she came to this conclusion and then asked her Research Branch for justification for it.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, it was ongoing before that.

**MR. WALDING:** I beg your pardon, I didn't hear the Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** I said that it had been started prior to that.

**MR. WALDING:** If the program has been started and has not yet been completed, is the Minister telling us that she used her crystal ball and was able to foresee what the Research Department had come up with?

**MRS. PRICE:** The Minimum Wage Board will be sitting in July and we'll have the findings from their report that everybody seems to be waiting for, at that time. There has been one survey done recently, the Canadian Minimum Wage Research, and it was published by the British Columbia Department of Labour and it is a new — you haven't seen it? — a new booklet that just came out.

**MR. WALDING:** No, I believe that I've not seen this report. Could the Minister just enlarge on that a little.

**MRS. PRICE:** I could get it for you, I think you'd find it very interesting.

**MR. WALDING:** Could the Minister tell the committee what was the subject of this research paper.

**MRS. PRICE:** I think it's basically what I've been saying here, about the danger of having a minimum wage, when le are trying to build up the economy in this province.

**MR. WALDING:** Then this B.C. study applied to the Manitoba economy?

**MRS. PRICE:** Pardon me.

**MR. WALDING:** Is the Minister telling us that this B.C. study referred to the Manitoba economy?

**MRS. PRICE:** It referred to the Manitoba economy and the rest of the economy in Canada.

**MR. WALDING:** On a slightly different topic, Mr. Chairman, did the Research Branch provide the Minister with any indication at all that Manitoba businesses have been moving to Ontario because of its lower minimum wage or that business has been moving from Saskatchewan to Manitoba because of our lower minimum wage or from Alberta to Manitoba because of our lower minimum wage?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, they haven't.

**MR. WALDING:** This is an indication from the Research Department to the Minister that this has not been happening or is the Minister telling me this of her own knowledge?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm telling you that they didn't relate anything of that nature to me.

**MR. WALDING:** So when the Minister is giving these reasons to us, the matter of business movement and business development on the one hand and the relationship between the minimum wage and unemployment on the other, she has no supporting documentation from her Research Department. Would that be true?

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't give you any remarks about the movement of business out of the province. What I said was that we had to keep our minimum wage competitive so that we could encourage businesses to move into the province and to stay in the province.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister then point to any instances of Saskatchewan or Alberta where it showed any loss of business growth due to the raising of its minimum wage to above Manitoba's rate?

**MRS. PRICE:** The only thing that I can tell you is the lack of business or business movement that has taken place in the last few years in this province, has to be due to something, and that is the one thing that this government is committed to do is to encourage businesses to move into the province and to encourage existing businesses to expand and improve the economy of the province and in that way we'll be able to raise the minimum wage.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman' the same argument is being used with respect to the income tax rate and the sales tax rate and the succession duties and to the corporate capital tax rate and the climate, and various other reasons. What I'm asking for is for the Minister to be able to give to the committee some indication that the minimum wage is a factor. Now, does she have any such supporting evidence, or does she not?

**MRS. PRICE:** As I suggested, it would be very advantageous for you and your colleagues to read the recent publication that was put out by the British Columbia government and I think you'll find supporting statements for the arguments that I have been giving you.

**MR. WALDING:** Do those supporting arguments, Mr. Chairman, take into account the various other different factors between the provinces?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, they do.

**MR. WALDING:** I would certainly be interested to see this study. Can the Minister tell us when it was produced and what the time frame of its supporting data was?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's a recent publication. I don't have the exact date, but as I said, I will get the book and give it to you.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Several times during the last couple of days, the Minister has mentioned that her department is making reviews of existing legislation. She mentioned it in her opening remarks and she mentioned it just during the conversation on this item, in that the Research Department was doing these particular reviews. I'm just wondering if she could clarify a few matters for us shortly.

No. 1 is, what is the purpose of the reviews that her department or that the Research Branch is doing of the existing labour legislation of Manitoba?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we feel that there are some regulations in some of the Acts that are not conducive to good business operations in this province, and we are at present looking them over, just the same as the previous government did some amending to legislation that wasn't in tune with their thinking. I think there's some that we feel needs adjusting.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister be more specific and give us, not all the details, but examples of that. I'm not asking for all of them, but I'm just asking for a few.

**MRS. PRICE:** We are in the throws of examining it, and I'm not prepared to give you any findings at this point because they are not coleted.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister says, Mr. Chairman, that they are looking at regulations that they, as a new government, consider not to be conducive to good business operations in the province of Manitoba. I am wondering if they are looking at it from that perspective or if they're looking at it from the perspective of regulations that are not conducive to good working conditions in the province of Manitoba?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mostly we feel that there is some that needs to be improved, not only for business but also for labour, that has to be looked at and adjusted and when they are completed, the Member for Churchill will see them.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister, Mr. Chairman, mentions then that they are also not only looking at the regulations from a perspective of making them more conducive to business in the province, which seems to be her first priority, but they are also looking at them from perspective of making the working conditions better in the province, and I'm just wondering, as she could not give me examples of the first, can she give me examples of the second?

**MRS. PRICE:** As I mentioned, we are right in the throws of studying it at present, and when they are completed, the member will see them.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister then tell us what form these throws of studying, what form they are taking, the research.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, as I said, in the last eight years during the previous government's tenure, there were many amendments made to many Acts and we are just doing the same, looking at some of the Acts and the Regulations and looking at them to make them a better Act and more workable.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister says, Mr. Chairman, that they are looking at them to make better Acts and more workable Acts. I would ask the Minister better and more workable from whose perspective?

**MRS. PRICE:** Employee and employer.

Thursday, June 8, 1978

**MR. COWAN:** I would assume also from the department's perspective seeing as how the department is the one that is responsible for the regulations and responsible for seeing that the regulations are kept. Is that not true?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I think if we improve them for the employee and the employer that it will make it better for the department also.

**MR. COWAN:** And how is the department or the Research Branch going about this research into the existing regulations in order to make them more conducive?

**MRS. PRICE:** They are studying the different jurisdictions across Canada and the different Acts, the same as the Workplace Safety Act was initiated here. It was initiated by taking a part of the Act from Britain, a part of Saskatchewan and a part of the States, and that's how the Workplace Safety Act was instituted and that's how we are studying and making research, with the other jurisdictions to do the same thing.

**MR. COWAN:** So then I would assume that the department is taking a look at the existing legislation, how it applies to the workplaces in Manitoba, studying other existing legislation and from that perspective drawing up or making changes that they feel are necessary in existing legislation. Is that essentially what is happening?

**MRS. PRICE:** If we feel there needs to be changes; we are just in the throws of studying it right now.

**MR. COWAN:** So the Minister is now saying that they're studying to see whether there exists a need for changes and they're not studying it with a view of making changes.

**MRS. PRICE:** We are not studying it to make changes for change sake, we are studying it to see if the existing ones can be improved on. If they can't, they will be left as is.

**MR. COWAN:** So the Minister is not saying, Mr. Chairman, now that the existing legislation needs to be improved on, she is saying that they are looking at the legislation to see if it needs to be improved on, they are not looking at the legislation right now with the goal of making changes?

**MRS. PRICE:** That is correct.

**MR. COWAN:** When would the results of this research be completed? The Minister says that we will be privy to them, and I'm sure we will, when the changes are being made if changes are necessary. I'm wondering if she has any idea and I'm not pressing her for a specific date, but just to give us some sort of a time reference, any idea as to when we can expect the results of this research to be made known?

**MRS. PRICE:** We are approaching the situation with great study and thought and conscience and it'll probably be ready toward the end of the year, but not before then.

**MR. COWAN:** Under this department, Mr. Chairman, would the Research Department be looking at existing regulations and existing standards for the purpose of making those changes that would be necessary to legislate workers back to work if strikes were to act drastically and adversely to the economy of Manitoba and the safety of Manitobans?

**MRS. PRICE:** That is not the purpose of the Research Department.

**MR. COWAN:** So the Research Department, Mr. Chairman, is not, will not be responsible for doing the research into developing that type of legislation?

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR.. COWAN:** I'm wondering if she could tell us at the moment who will be responsible for developing that type of legislation?

**MRS. PRICE:** There hasn't been any thought given to any in that respect at this time.

Thursday, June 8, 1978

**MR. COWAN:** Now that last statement, Mr. Chairman, seems to be at odds with previous statements made by the Minister in the House, and I believe in her opening remarks, although I could stand corrected, I would have to re-read the opening remarks. But she said that if — and in this committee I believe she said that if strikes were to drastically, and I think those were her words and she made that very clear, drastically affect in an adverse manner the economy or the safety or the well-being of Manitobans, that her department and her government would not be in opposition to bringing forth legislation to legislate those strikes out of existence. Is that incorrect? Do I have an incorrect

**MRS. PRICE:** You have it correct, but I said "if."

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister, Mr. Chairman, then said, if that should happen. Does the Minister foresee that as happening?

**MRS. PRICE:** Not at the present time I don't.

**MR. COWAN:** Is the Minister then prepared to wait until we have a strike on our hands that her government decides is detrimental to the economy in a drastic manner, and then draw up the legislation, or is her department now working on what types of legislation will be brought forth at that time?

**MRS. PRICE:** It is the responsibility of the government to look after the best interests of the people of Manitoba and I said "if it should be that there is a drastic deterioration in the economy, or the health or the safety of the province of Manitoba", then we would have to exercise our responsibility and do something about it, but I see nothing at this time that would denote that we would have to go to those lengths.

**MR. COWAN:** How would the Minister go about in that case exercising her government's responsibility as Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** That would be a decision of Cabinet.

**MR. COWAN:** It would be a decision of Cabinet to exercise that responsibility, or would it be a decision of Cabinet as to how to go about drawing up the legislation, and it would take an act of legislation to legislate those strikes out of existence.

**MRS. PRICE:** It would be both.

**MR. COWAN:** It would be both, I wonder if the Minister . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Both would be a decision of Cabinet.

**MR. COWAN:** Both would be a decision of Cabinet. So the Minister is telling me that there are no contingency plans at the moment being drawn up to bring an end to strikes either in the public service or the private sector if those strikes were deemed by her government to be detrimental to the economy, safety or health of the Province of Manitoba.

**MRS. PRICE:** At the present time there is nothing that denotes that action of this type is necessary.

**MR. COWAN:** I agree with the Minister, Mr. Chairman. At the present time there is nothing that would indicate that action of that sort is necessary, but it's the Minister who originally brought this subject up in the House and in this committee and I'm just wondering because she has brought it up, obviously something brought it to her own mind, and I'm wondering, because she has indicated that there might at some time be a need, if she is not making those sort of plans at the moment to draw up legislation so that that legislation is ready. I would suggest to her, if that's what she wants to do and that is not what I would want to do, and that is not what our government did, but if that is what their government wants to do or if their government sees there might be a possibility of having to do, then they should be drawing up legislation so that they are not at one moment, one moment decide . . .

Mr. Chairman, I would ask your protection from the members on the government side here. It's very hard for me to carry a train of thought and conversation when they are chattering away in such a manner as to disrupt my questioning of the Minister which I feel I have a right to do in

Thursday, June 8, 1978

a spirit of co-operation. Now I would continue.

I would ask the Minister if they are going to wait until a strike happens that they feel to be detrimental and they are going to wait until the moment that they feel it to be drastically detrimental, and at that point rush into drawing up some legislation?

**MRS. PRICE:** I will repeat. At this moment we see no reason for any legislation of that nature, but if it should happen that the people of Manitoba were jeopardized, it is the responsibility of this government to do something. We would be prepared to legislate them back to work, but at this particular time there is absolutely no need for it.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister, would the Research Department be responsible for drawing up and drafting the legislation that would legislate those workers back to work.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, they would not.

**MR. COWAN:** Who would be responsible, because according to everything I have before me, it is the Research Department that is responsible for drafting legislation, at least in a preparatory form. It is not the Research Department that is responsible for the final draft, but it at least is the Research Department's responsibility to begin to initiate the process of drafting that legislation.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have not at any time said that it is the responsibility of the Research Department to draft up legislation. We have a legislative counsel who has been doing that precise thing for many years in this building and they would continue to do so.

**MR. COWAN:** Then, has the legislative counsel been asked by her government to start doing research into the various types of legislation that might be necessary to legislate workers back to work if her government so deemed it necessary?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have already told the Member for Churchill that there has not been anything drawn up or suggested or deemed necessary at this particular time to draw legislation of that nature.

**MR. COWAN:** Moving off the, well maybe staying on this section for one moment. Jim Wood I understand is the Acting Director of the branch at this moment, is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** He's the Director.

**MR. COWAN:** He is the permanent Director of that branch?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes he is.

**MR. COWAN:** And I would just ask the Minister in that case, was there a competition for the position as permanent Director of that branch because from my understanding of the situation, Mr. Cam Shepherd who was an honoured man in this field had an untimely death of a heart attack last year and I might add that he is greatly missed by most of us here, or by all of us here I feel I would be safe in saying that, and that his contributions in this field are well thought of throughout the province, and that Mr. Wood at that time took over as Acting Director, and since that time you are informing me that Mr. Wood has been made permanent Director, and I'm wondering if that had been done by a competition?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Wood was the Acting Director after Mr. Shepherd's untimely death and he was in that position for a number of months and just recently he has been made the Director.

**MR. COWAN:** I'm wondering if the Minister can inform us as to when just recently he was made the permanent Director?

**MRS. PRICE:** About two months ago.

**MR. COWAN:** About two months ago, well then my congratulations go out to Mr. Wood. And, the Minister is telling me that this was not done by means of a competition?

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR. COWAN:** Well maybe the Minister can inform me then, is this going to be a standard practice

of her government to place people in these positions without competitions?

**MRS. PRICE:** He was the Assistant Director before, it was a natural thing that he would be put up into that position and this government believes in the merit system and inter-department promotions.

**MR. COWAN:** Most governments believe in the merit system and inter-department promotions and I'm not questioning the qualifications nor the capabilities of Mr. Wood. I am sure that he will do a fine and capable job. I'm just questioning the manner in which he was placed in that position. Is it going to be the practice of the government to place people in senior level positions, as in this case, without a competition? Is this a precedent in other words?

**MRS. PRICE:** I cannot speak for the whole government and what their practice is. I'll speak for my department and it was a natural promotion that Mr. Wood be put in there, he was the most logical person to be put in that position.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, thank you Madam Minister. Mr. Chairman, I would agree that he was the most logical and probably the most capable person to put in that position, which would lead me to believe that one would have a competition so as to clear the air, so as his qualifications could be matched with other persons' qualifications and that he would have no worry in the department, and the Minister would have no worry as him getting the job because he was the one that would naturally fit into that position. So the competition in that manner would have been a competition more to clear the air and just to see if perhaps there was a more capable individual who wanted the job. I'm not saying there is, but I think that there should be a chance for people to apply in those instances. I'm wondering if the Minister is going to tell us now or reaffirm that when instances such as this happen, that the positions will be filled without competitions being called.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, they won't. It won't be a practice. In this particular case, in an office of six people, I don't think the competition would have been very varied.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes and the Minister in statements yesterday was just mention how we have a province of a million people and it would not be hard to get people to do /certain jobs and I'm not just exactly sure in reference to what. So it would seem to me in a province of a million people and a country of many times that number, that there would be many capable people that could adequately and capably handle this sort of a position and the Minister, by not holding a competition, cut those people off from the opportunity of even applying for the position. I'm wondering if the Minister is going to say that this is a rarity, that it will not happen again, that they will be holding competitions which would seem to be a logical and rational way to fill these positions, or they will not be holding competitions.

**MRS. PRICE:** We will be holding competitions.

**MR. COWAN:** From this time forward then, Mr. Chairman, we can expect when a position such as the position of Director of the Research Branch becomes open for whatever reason, a competition will be held and that that position will be filled by the most capable person that applied into that competition.

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't think that this is the first time that there has been a person elevated in a department without a competition. I believe that was a fairly standard practice over the last few years.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure it is not the first time. All I am trying to do, and I'm not sure but I could stand corrected, it probably happened over the last eight years, but what I want to find out now seeing as how this is a new Minister, is how she's going to handle her department, not how previous governments handled her department, or their department at that time, but how the Minister as Minister responsible for that department is going to handle it and in that respect, I'm asking her will competitions be the standard practice?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm going to handle my department in the most efficient way I find possible and in this particular case I felt that Mr. Wood was the most knowledgeable and likely man to fill the position, as you say, after Mr. Shepherd's untimely death.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is the Minister then saying that she considers competitions

to be an inefficient way of filling

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I certainly do not, I think it's a very efficient way but in this particular case the logical person in my opinion was Mr. Wood.

**MR. COWAN:** So the Minister is saying that competitions are efficient, that they will be using competitions in the future and that this was a rarity and should not happen again. I just want to clarify the matter.

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in the statement uttered by the Minister with respect to the policy of the government on the merit system. The Minister, as I understood her, indicated that the government is committed to the merit system and inter-departmental promotions. In that connection I would like her to then explain to me, since the government has indicated that one Vivian Rosenberg did merit consideration, but for some reason not yet explained to us she was not a candidate for these inter-departmental promotions. I'm wondering whether the Minister can clarify that for us.

**MRS. PRICE:** Firstly, I believe that is not in my department so I don't feel I am responsible for answering that question. And secondly, it pertains to Civil Service which will be coming up later.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Member for Lac du Bonnet. Can I ask him a question? Do you not think that the Member for Churchill was asking about the Research Director and how he obtained the position, but to discuss with the Minister a method of promoting in general, do you not think that should be discussed under Civil Service Commission Estimates?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I have no problem as to where one should discuss what, excepting in entering the room here I noticed the debate is fairly far-flung, so I thought I was in order in that connection. I am prepared to wait until that moment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George, I apologize for missing you earlier. You had a very large person sitting between you and I and I could not see past him.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise some matters in respect to the comments the Minister made while discussing matters of the minimum wage and research with the Member for St. Vital. As I understood the Minister indicating that she is trying, in delegating her responsibilities within the department, to make our province more competitive with respect to the minimum wage and that she is trying to, rather than lose business from Manitoba, she is trying to attract business to Manitoba in the process of the new policies that the new administration has brought in. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to comment and relate to me her comments several months ago when she indicated that the layoffs at Inco in Thompson, Manitoba were as a direct result of the policies of the previous administration within Manitoba where the layoffs in Thompson occurred in numbers, I believe, somewhere close to 600 and the Province of Manitoba's minimum wage is at \$2.95 an hour and you look at our sister province to the east, where their minimum wage, I believe is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2.65 an hour, and the layoffs in Ontario were over 3,000. In addition to that we have had losses of jobs in industry by the nature of Gambles who have moved their head office out of Manitoba; the Willson Stationery Industry in the province of Manitoba who moved their offices out of Manitoba and we've had the industry of Greb Shoes who have moved major industrial offices out of Manitoba. All of these businesses, Mr. Chairman, have moved since the new government has come in, since the announcement of their glorious policies of tax reduction, of no minimum wage, of the freezing of minimum wage, the reduction of corporate taxes, the reduction of estate taxes, the reduction of income taxes, and yet all these businesses have moved from the province of Manitoba.

I want the Minister of Labour to tell me what other policies she is proposing to bring forward to either attract businesses to Manitoba because since October, there have been massive losses of employment to the workers of Manitoba, even with the policies of her government that she has brought in and that she has crowed about in the last number of months. So I want her to comment what else is she going to do to hold on to these workers, to bring in competition?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Member for St. George. I would think that a question like you've posed to the Minister should come under the Minister's salary. It's a general question in relation to statements that she has made in the past as Minister. Do you not feel that it should be dealt with under the Minister's salary?

**MR. URUSKI:** No, Mr. Chairman, I was relating that matter to the Research Department. I wanted to know what type of research has been done to analyze the losses of employment within this province as they have related to the tax policies, the tax measures that that government has brought in, and I wonder what the Research Department has to say when they analyze, or if they analyze, some of the economic policies of this government.

**MRS. PRICE:** Firstly, that is not a problem of the Research Department of the Department of Labour, that is for the research of the government, the Industry and Commerce, Finance, etc.

**MR. URUSKI:** Well, is the Minister of Labour not concerned about the workers of this province in the loss of jobs that they have sustained as a result of these business closures and these layoffs?

**MRS. PRICE:** Of course I'm concerned, but by the same token these businesses didn't just suddenly start running out in October. The economy in Manitoba had fallen so badly that people were making plans to move out of the province before October 11th.

**MR. URUSKI:** Is that the reason why INCO in Manitoba and Ontario announced those layoffs in October?

**MRS. PRICE:** There's a couple of reasons why INCO had their problems, and one of them was the previous government's intervention into the mining industry by demanding to be partners with them and making it difficult for them to operate and secondly, it was the nickel abundance.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for her statements but if I recall the province of Ontario, in their recent Budget, allocated some \$5 million for the mining industry within that province, and they did not prevent the over 3,000 worker layoffs within that province. Is that the reason why Ontario had five times the amount of layoffs as we did in Manitoba, because the province of Ontario interfered in the mining industry, Conservative Ontario?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm not responsible for the province of Ontario, I'm dealing with the province of Manitoba.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Minister is not responsible for Ontario, then how does she rationalize her statement that Manitoba, having the layoffs of 600 as compared to 3,000 in Ontario somehow caused the fall of INCO by our intrusion in the mining industry in this province, and Ontario being the nice guys had layoffs in excess of 3,000?

Does the Research Department, Mr. Chairman, not do any analysis in terms of these layoffs and the problems encountered as a result of the closures of the industries, such as Greb Shoes, such as Willson's Stationery, such as Gambles and the like, in terms of the —(Interjection)— Gambles.

Mr. Chairman, does the Research Department not analyze and try and bring forward some alternatives and varying approaches that might be used by the Department of Labour to ensure that workers are not displaced as a result of the upheavals and large massive layoffs within industry? What type of research is the Department of Labour undertaking to look at and analyze these upheavals within industry?

**MRS. PRICE:** This type of research is not done by my department. It's done by Industry and Commerce and Finance.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would anticipate that the Department of Industry and Commerce in terms of their now policy, in terms of providing incentives to business to expand and the like, by the newly announced grant program, is trying to encourage businesses to expand. But surely the Department of Labour must want to, in terms of their mandate, analyze the effects on the work force within Manitoba and surely would look into the effects on the work force as a result of these layoffs, to assist the Minister in bringing forward policies and even legislation in terms of providing alternatives, so that huge massive layoffs and worker displacement can be somehow softened in terms of if huge layoffs have to occur, either by retraining, either by providing retraining programs

rather than retrenching our retraining programs in our community colleges, by expanding worker retraining rather than putting them on the unemployment rolls or welfare rolls. Is there no research capability or capacity to analyze these things and advise the government within her department?

**MRS. PRICE:** The Department of Labour is a regulatory department and it looks after the labour relations of employees and employers, and the research as far as manpower is concerned goes on in Continuing Education.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that there was a tremendous slowdown in the economy of this province. She attributed that to the previous government and so I assume that she can now demonstrate the reverse has already taken place, and I would be interested in her statistics. I would like to know from her whether the Research Branch of her department was able to inform her that as a result of the policies of the previous government, there were huge dislocations with respect to labour stability in the province and the economy of the province.

**MRS. PRICE:** That is not the work of the Research Department of the Department of Labour, that again comes under Industry and Commerce and Finance.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, since it is not the department that has so researched and advised her could I then ask her what the source of her findings are, or sources, since she has made the statement that there was a substantial economic downturn due to the policies of the previous government?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have read statistics to prove that from the mining industry. I haven't got the figures on me, but I can get them and tell you the decline and the years as they started to decline, and it started when the previous government intervened in the mining industry.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister then, whether she believes everything that she reads from whatever source without doing any research into the accuracy of whatever is stated, said, written, or whether she has a capacity to further research that information to determine its accuracy?

**MRS. PRICE:** The research that was given from the mining industry, I respect their findings. It came from very reliable resources.

**MR. USKIW:** Does the Minister then indicate to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that if the mining industry was to plead its case, that the royalty rates should be reduced to zero because they are having some difficulty that the Minister would take that as a given, that she would not then research that to determine whether it's factual or otherwise?

**MRS. PRICE:** When I made reference to the decline in the mining industry, it was from the source that I said that I had read, that I'm prepared to show you when I get out the figures. That is not my position, to be doing all the research on the mining industry. There are the other departments as I told you, the Department of Mines, Industry and Commerce, Finance, but I felt that the source that I read that from was very reliable and it's my prerogative if I'd like to believe it.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I agree that it's the Minister's prerogative to believe whatever she wishes to believe, even though it may be based on her own philosophical bias. I simply ask her whether it's reasonable and responsible on the part of a Minister of the Crown to believe everything or anything that a party that has a vested interest in their submission puts before her?

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't believe everything and anything that I read, but I chose to believe it from the source that I got it from. It's my prerogative.

**MR. USKIW:** So we have established then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has had no research on which she based her statement of a moment ago with respect to the reasons for the economic slowdown in Manitoba.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have no answer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the statement which she indicated that she read from bulletins from the mining industry, and from that information she has presumed that the mining industry has declined in Manitoba because of policies of the previous government, is she not aware that the downturn in the mining industry is of such a nature that it extends worldwide, that it is not a Manitoba-only phenomena.

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't attribute all the decline in the mining to it, I said that that was part of it.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Was the Minister suggesting that there's been a disproportionate downturn in the mining industry in Manitoba in comparison to the mining activity in other provinces in Canada?

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't make a comparison with the other provinces, but the statistics I read about the decline in Manitoba began when the previous government entered into partnership with the mining industry.

**MR. PAWLEY:** But the Minister is referring to the downturn in the copper industry specifically?

**MRS. PRICE:** In the mining industry.

**MR. PAWLEY:** In the mining industry. When you receive information from the mining industry in which they present their particular point of view which of course is based upon their particular vested interest point of view, or from trade union movement or from any other vested interest group in society, what resources do you have available to you through your own Research Department to ascertain whether than information is reliable that is being handed to you?

**MRS. PRICE:** That is not the job of the Research Department of mine. I repeated before, it's the research that has taken place, and in this particular — I took my information from what I had read from the mining industry. I didn't do any researching with others and it has nothing to do with the Research Department and my department.

**MR. PAWLEY:** But you are prepared to acknowledge, and if I'm being unfair correct me, that the downturn in the mining industry in Manitoba is not disproportionate to the downturn in the mining industry in other provinces in Canada in which mining is being undertaken?

**MRS. PRICE:** I couldn't tell you, I didn't make a comparison with the other provinces.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, would it not have been useful for you to have made a comparison before you attributed most of the blame, which I must infer from your remarks upon the policies of the previous government?

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't say most of the blame, I said part of the blame.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, are you now suggesting that there's only a small portion of blame attributable to the previous government?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm not suggesting any proportion, I'm saying the start of the decline of the mining industry began with the previous government's intervention into the mining industry.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well if the . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't say what proportion.

**MR. PAWLEY:** You indicate that the downturn occurred at that particular time. Do you mean to say that you've not checked out from your other sources to see if the downturn in the mining industry in other provinces did not occur at the same time, at the same time as you are attributing a particular cause to the downturn of the mining industry in Manitoba?

**MRS. PRICE:** I told you I didn't go into the other jurisdictions, that my statements that I made was from the sources I got from the mining industry in Manitoba.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would you not be prepared to agree with me that it would have been fairer for you to have resorted to information as to what is happening in other jurisdictions, particularly when you are dealing with information purely and clearly from a vested interest group, to ascertain the accuracy of that information?

**MRS. PRICE:** As I said, I made a statement that was pertaining to Manitoba and I was satisfied that what I had read was correct.

**MR. PAWLEY:** You are aware that there's been a gigantic downturn in the copper mining industry for instance, everywhere from Zambia to Chili to all the other major copper producing countries in the world over the last four or five years, are you not?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'd like to interrupt. Doesn't the Member for Selkirk believe that this type of questioning should go to the Minister under her salary. These are statements that she made as a Minister of the Crown and I wonder how they relate to Research in Labour.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it relates very clearly to Research in Labour because obviously this department is not functioning at all, or the Minister is not relying upon this department. She has indicated that she has received information from the mining industry, she's accepted it in total without relating it to the research in her own particular section, so, Mr. Chairman, I say it's highly relevant and members on this side have to draw the conclusion from the answers we're receiving that this department is not contributing in aiding the Minister in efforts to objectively analyze information being fed to her, and as a result she's being lead down blind alleys because she has no availability it appears to information from her own department, or is not taking advantage of the information.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'm of the opinion that she made the statement, if she did make the statement, as a member of the Legislature and as a straight Minister of the Crown and I don't think it has anything to do with research pertaining to Labour.

**MR. USKIW:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the Chair is to rule in that way, then the Chair should have ruled her statement out of order and out of context of this debate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All I'm trying to do . . . I haven't ruled them out of . . .

**MR. USKIW:** She has walked into the trap. We didn't ask that question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I asked the Member for Selkirk . . . I didn't say that the Member for Selkirk was out of order, did I? I just asked the Member for Selkirk if he didn't think that his present questioning would have been more suitable under the Minister's salary than under this particular item. I asked the Member for Selkirk a question; he has given me an answer. He thinks he's in order; I haven't said he's out of order but I do say and believe that we are on (c) Research of the Department of Labour, and I thought that maybe the Member for Selkirk's questioning, which is perfectly in order, should perhaps come under (a), the Minister's Compensation, which is the area that I would think that she would be responsible for her actions. The Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You may carry on if you think you're in the right place. I was asking you a question; I wa n't telling you that you're out of order.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister if she receives representations from the Canadian Labour Congress indicating that due to certain policies of her government labour conditions in Manitoba are worsening to the extent that the economy is affected? What means does she have within this particular branch of her department to check that information out in an objective fashion?

**MRS. PRICE:** I haven't received a statement to that effect. But I would also like to while I have the floor, to draw a parallel to what you say is my lack of research. The Member for Brandon East made a statement on a program on CBC today accusing me of having harassed the environmental

engineer from the Department of Mines, which is a down outright lie. I told him in the House I had not spoken one word to the individual, nor had my deputy and he had the audacity to get on 24 Hours today and make that statement. If he had researched it he would have known that I had not made that statement. So there's a parallel for your researching before anybody makes any statements.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the Member for Brandon East will deal with that on his own occasion, but what is concerning me and I hope that the Minister realizes the concern that we must feel on this side, if she is accepting information from vested interest groups and she has acknowledged that she has received information from the mining industry. Now I happen to think that that information that she has quoted to us from the mining industry is incorrect. However, I do feel that we should always attempt to analyze the information that we receive from vested interest groups within the community, within society. I'm just wondering whether there is a capacity, if the Minister's not using that capacity to check out, i.e., the information from the mining industry in her department, whether it's because she didn't feel it was necessary to check it out, or whether there was not sufficient capacity within the Research Branch for her to check out that information. I think that information is incorrect and I'm just asking the Minister whether she would not have felt it better to have checked out that information, analyzed it through her own Research Branch so that she would not be subjected to this type of questioning from those that disagree with the information that she has relied upon.

**MRS. PRICE:** Are you telling me that there's a law for me and a law for the Member for Brandon East then. It was quite all right for him to go on the radio in front of thousands of people and accuse me of something that I told him in the House today that I did not do, but that's all right for him to do, but I should have gone through all the jurisdictions and make comparisons before I made that statement. Is that what you're telling me?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, I would like to say to Madam Minister that the Member for Brandon East I'm sure will discuss that on its own occasion, certainly the Member for Brandon East isn't presenting Estimates, you are responsible for the Estimates of the Department of Labour, not the Member for Brandon East. You're responsible for the expenditure of this particular section of the Department of Labour, not the Member for Brandon East so that I can't relate the questions to statements the Member for Brandon East made on 24 Hours. I am simply concerned on the instance of the mining industry and apparently allegations that they have made whether you had within your department. . . if you haven't got within your department the capacity, then simply tell me that you don't have the capacity to check out information that you receive from vested interest groups, whether it's labour or management or industry, that's all I want to know.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have the capacity in my Research Department to research what I feel is relevant to the Department of Labour.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, is it not relevant for you to have checked out the allegation that NDP government policies have affected the labour force in Manitoba pertaining to the mining industry? Would that not have been relevant for you to have checked that out within your own Research Department?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's a decision that I made. When I made that statement I felt I had reliable resources, and I still feel it.

**MR. PAWLEY:** But you didn't use those reliable resources, you've just finished indicating that to us. That's all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned with the budget of \$135,000 for Research. The Minister has indicated that in dealing with what she believes as to the downturn of the economy and the unemployment situation created specifically in Thompson, was related to information given to her which she did not check out with her Research Department because she did not think it was necessary or advisable, which means somehow that the Research Department is being used in a selective way and now we know that she does not deem it advisable to check out with her Research Department information that, as indicated, she has received from the mining industry and which she accepted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, she also indicated I believe that her Research Department is not involved

in measuring the causes and effects on the general economy of Manitoba and I gather then that the opinions she has expressed about the downturn of the economy relating to policies of the former government are apparently results of research of departments of Industry and Finance. I want to know definitely if that is what she said, because I think that's what she said, that Finance and Industry are responsible for that kind of research. So, I want to know, is that correct? Am I misintrepeting her?

**MRS. PRICE:** I said that my Department of Research is not there to check the findings of the mining industry in that regard, that that would better be found in the Department of Finance or the Department of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister said that the general study before we got to the mines, that the general study affecting the situation, the economy in Manitoba is one where the information is obtainable from the research people in Finance and Industry and Commerce and I believe that she indicated to us that she has information, that her opinion is based on research done in those two departments. I want to know if those two departments have to her knowledge been doing that kind of a study.

**MRS. PRICE:** I did not at any time say that I had got information from either department from their Research Department. I said that that would be the most likely place it would be found, in the Research Department of the Department of Finance or Industry and Commerce.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So that the Minister is not relying on any information which she has received directly or indirectly from any other research group in the government relating to the reasons for the downturn in the economy and the creation of unemployment in Manitoba. Is that a correct statement?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I told you where I got my information from?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, could you just . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** I said I told you at least ten times now that I got my information from some statistics that I got from the mining industry and that is where I got them. I felt it reliable and I made a statement on it and I still think it reliable.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, that relates to the layoffs in Thomson. But the Minister made other statements. She said that the unemployment situation in Manitoba is in part a result of the policies of the previous government and that information, I assume she did not get from the mining industry as such, but other sources, either other sources which she used other than her own Research Department which is there to advise her?

**MRS. PRICE:** I've answered that question for the Member for Selkirk, St. George and now you. I have answered those. How many times do I have to answer the same questions for you?

**MR. SPIVAK:** We're commencing a cross-examination that realistically I have . . . Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order. The Honourable Minister is a member of the Executive Council and is privy to a great deal of information that is brought forward to the Executive Council from different sources and from different Ministers. She's under no obligation as a member of that Executive Council to in any way detail, or in what way that information was received. There's in attempt here in dealing with the ministerial responsibility and the research within her department to try and to cross-examine her on how she arrived at a conclusion from information and sources which include not only the sources of her own department, but the sources, Mr. Chairman, the sources that come from her knowledge as a member member of the Executive Council, and I suggest that these questions are out of our order and I suggest that her answer and response as a member of the Executive Council that those conclusions have in fact been drawn as a result of information furnished to the Executive Council.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, Order. The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, we're on the point of order and I was asking a question and the Minister. . . Mr. Spivak has jumped in in order to indicate that the Minister doesn't have to answer. It's true she doesn't, but she is the one who referred, she is the Minister . . .

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister without Portfolio.

**MR. SPIVAK:** I simply said that in with respect to the Minister who is a Member of the Executive Council that the cross-examination here of how she arrived at a decision as a Member of the Executive Council is really not a part of the function of this committee, nor is it a proper order on the part of . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, would you explain how that became a matter of privilege, when I was in the middle of a point of order. Could you explain how you allowed that person to interrupt me on privilege?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Member for St. Johns, I had to hear him out before I could rule whether he was in order or not.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Would you now tell us if he was in order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, this is the Minister who, in her capacity as Minister of Labour, is required to advise and consult on the question of unemployment and on the question of minimum wage and generally on the question of the employment of people within Manitoba. This Minister has a Research Department. That Research Department is now before us. We have been attempting to get a picture of what that Research Department does. Mr. Chairman, you have been here all through the evening, unlike some of the other people who have already participated and you know very well that we do not have a clear picture of the work that this Research Department of some five or six personnel is doing. We are finding out what it is not doing, and therefore I think it's relevant to know what they are not doing to find out on what basis this Minister forms conclusions within her scope of work, and therefore we were talking about unemployment, we were talking about minimum wage and we have now determined that the Minister has blamed the general economy, the downturn in the economy, her reasons for not recommending a minimum wage increase, on the unhappy economic picture in Manitoba and has laid blame on the policies of the previous government and has used, in relation to the mining to Thompson, the fact that the previous government went into partnership with mines and exploration, and said that she based that not on the research of this line that we're dealing with now, her own department, but on some sort of statements or publication of the mining industry. But she also said, and that's why I'm trying to get clarification, that the work that is done in assessing the impact on the economy is more properly done, and these are my words not hers, by the Departments of Industry and Finance.

hat I'm trying to find out is, has she in her capacity as Minister of Labour relied on information given to her by these other two departments of government and their Research people that brought her to the conclusion of making the statement she did? I think she said not. I want to make sure that she said not, because then there's no use going into those departments to find out what those research people have been doing. That's my point.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** I said I did not go to those departments. I said when I was making my speech that I had taken my statistics from the mining industry and with regard to the workings of the Research Department of the Department of Labour, it's exactly the same and the same people that are still running it with exactly the same format as it was in the eight years that you were in government. So you should be quite well aware of the workings of the Research Department.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So, Mr. Chairman, it is therefore clear that the Minister has not relied on this Research Department to evaluate the information she is using on which she is basing the speeches she has made in this regard. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm willing to pass the floor, but just draw to your attention and to the Ministers, that she has called a Member of the Legislature a liar. She said he told an outright lie and I'd lay that on the record because, Mr. Chairman, you are the Chairman and some of her colleagues across the way may be of greater experience than she has and I'm just mentioning that that is what was done and nothing was said. So, I bring that to your attention, because, Mr. Chairman, you are the Chairman tonight.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Chairman, I made the remark that the Member for Brandon East on the 24 Hours

program tonight made the statement that I harassed that individual, when I have not spoken to him. I wouldn't know him if I passed him in the hall, other than seeing him, and if that isn't an outright lie after I made the statement to him in the House that I had not, he went on the air and made that statement.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, now I do raise it as a point of order. I don't know what was said. I did not hear the program.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, then don't enter into it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister ought to . . . I think she ought to relax for a minute and realize that what she has said is not parliamentary. Mr. Chairman, if you can't control that Minister of Highways who can't be kept quiet at any time, even by you, Mr. Chairman, he will continually do that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, order.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I have raised the point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. The Member for St. Johns has the floor, please.

**MR. GREEN:** I vote it be taken to Privileges and Elections to see whether the Member for Brandon East is a liar. I saw the program and I never heard him say that .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor or don't I? Mr. Chairman, I have raised the point of order that the Minister of Labour has accused a Member of the Legislature in this committee of having told a lie. I have heard the Minister of Highways scream four or five times, pointing at that member, he is a liar. Now, I want to know, Mr. Chairman, what do you do about that? I am asking you, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order what do you do about that fact?!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, immediately I'll consult with the Clerk.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Okay, that's sensible.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Members of the Committee, and in particular to the Member for St. Johns, the matter went by or slipped by, basically unnoticed by all members, the member who the Minister referred to did not raise the matter until you have now raised it. If you wish we can return to the House and call in the Speaker, and have the matter dealt with. Do you wish for us to do that?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I was not prepared to interrupt the conversation when that was said, but I am putting it to you as Chairman of the committee that a number of us present heard what was said, besides that when I raised the point the Minister of Highways started to scream, pointing out hysterically he is a liar, he is a liar. Mr. Chairman, you are the Chairman, and I don't think it is for me to suggest what should be done. I'm putting on you the full responsibility, because you are the Chairman of this committee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I've been trying to catch your eye for the last 10 or 15 minutes. I would like to Honourable Minister to withdraw her assertion because if she and other members listened to that program very carefully, she will know, and others who have listened to it will agree, I'm sure, that in answer to a question I stated, I made an assertion based on information given to me from a confidential source, and a confidential source stated that this unfortunate civil servant was now being raked over the coals, and those were the very words that were expressed to me by that source, and also that source indicated to me that it was the Minister of Labour, the Deputy Minister of Labour and the Executive Assistant to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management who were responsible for that particular raking over the coals. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I stated then and I repeat it now, and the Minister can . . . I heard the Minister in the House . . .

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, . . . this constant interruption from the Member for Lakeside you made no effort to maintain order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** In the meantime I'm trying to get some direction from the Clerk as to how to handle this situation. I can't control each and every member. I can ask them to be quiet. If they won't be quiet, that's not my job, I'm not the policeman, I'm just the Chairman. The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** . . . the Minister of Labour is being very careless in her observations. She's being very careless in her statements and I would expect more of her than that, and so I reject any assertion, any statement by her that I stated an outright lie, because that is simply not correct and if she had listened to the program carefully and what I said, she would retract that particular statement because I simply repeated the information that a confidential source gave me.

**MRS PRICE:** Did he check it?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister responsible for Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** The Minister used the comparison of what the member said on television tonight as being a situation that he didn't research it, and why should she have to look to . research. That was the statement that she made and the Member for Brandon East just finished saying, he assumed, he assumed. Where was his research? That was what the Minister was saying. That's what the Minister was saying and he assumed is what he said.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I think that what the member has said is that the Minister has said that if the Member for Brandon East can tell lies, I can tell lies, and therefore she was calling yourself a liar. On that basis, I think we should close the matter.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, she said there's one rule for him and not one rule for me.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the issue, because this is a very disturbing thing. I thought that at one time the Minister made a mistake and was ready to forever hold her peace, but if she is now repeating the suggestion that mining employment has gone down in the province of Manitoba due to the activities of the New Democratic Party Government, that she has researched to that effect, then I guess I have to accept her statement, even though I find it very difficult to believe, then some researchers are liars because no mining company, Mr. Chairman, no mining company has ever made that assertion, that the mining employment has gone down in the province of Manitoba as a result of policies of the New Democratic Party Program. Let's get the record clear, that in 1973 mining activity was at its highest in our province and I really can't take the credit for it for the New Democratic Party, but the Minister would have you believe that because we were in power for four years, mining activities soured ahead in the province of Manitoba. . In 1969 Tantalum opened up, in 1972 Leaf Rapids opened up, Rattan opened up, INCO was going full blast, Hudson Bay was going full blast, but it really didn't have much to do with the New Democratic Party it had to do with the conditions, the price of the products and what have you.

The Minister is suggesting that employment went down because of the New Democratic Party and she has statistics to that effect. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say this, there were no such statistics available in the Department of Mines up until October 11th, 1977. I believe that there was no such statistics available in the Department of Labour up until October 11, 1977 or else they would have given them to us, so what are her statistics based on? Her statistics, Mr. Chairman, are based on the following uncontrovertible facts, that with regard to exploration the calendar year, 1977, will be the highest year on record in terms of exploration dollars spent in the province of Manitoba, and also the greatest number of companies participating in mining exploration in the province of Manitoba. So if we are talking about exploration, it probably went up, although I could not swear to it, it probably went up and directly as a result of the New Democratic Party Program in exploration and will go down this year because of the removal from that program, that's dollars and cents, people working on exploration.

With regard to production, the New Democratic Party has had no effect on production whatsoever, and that has been conceded to me by all of the mining companies, none of them have ever claimed that it's because of the New Democratic Party policies that the price of copper went from over a dollar at one point down to 52 cents, now it's gone up to somewhat higher, it's over 60 cents now, that the mining companies first reduced in Ontario — not in Manitoba, and I'm not even saying

that that's because they loved us although that would be the way in which the Minister would want to talk — they went down in Sudbury because it was more convenient to reduce more drastically in Sudbury than in Manitoba. They used to come to me regularly and say that the reductions in Manitoba are rather fortunate because we won't have to let anybody go, we merely have to stop hiring and there being such a big turnover, they used the phrase familiar to the Conservative Party "attrition" — attrition. Certainly activity has gone down but it has had nothing whatsoever to do with the New Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman.

I would say to the Minister . . . And you know, Mr. Chairman, I seldom feel sorry or sympathize with a political adversary but I have to tell the Minister that I feel sorry for her, that she's walking around with this absolutely wild notion in her head that somehow employment in mining has gone down in the Province of Manitoba as a result of the policies of the New Democratic Party. The fact is that the reverse is true and mining activity will go down in the Province of Manitoba directly as a result of Conservative policy because the Conservative government is taking money out of exploration. The amount of money that they take out will not be replaced by the private sector. The kind of program that we offered in the past will now be available on a voluntary basis, it is true, and to that extent you will retain something and, by the way, what you do retain will be as a result of New Democratic Party programs, not Conservative programs, because the Conservatives had no participation program, voluntary or compulsory. What the New Democratic Party did was to say to the people of this province, "We are going to maintain a level of mining activity." You may criticize us on the basis of spending dollars. If you want to use that, go ahead, but don't criticize us on the basis of reducing activity because activity went up and it will go down as a result of the Conservative program because the Minister of Mines has himself said, when questioned on the Estimates, that I cannot guarantee the people of the province what was previously guaranteed, and he didn't use these words. But I said to him, "We indicated a certain level of activity. If it had to be all public, it would be all public. Up to now, it's been half public, half private. We guaranteed a certain level. Can you guarantee the said level?" And the Minister said, "No. It's true that as a result of this program we are hoping to attract them but we cannot say that they will." So what we had is assurance 100 percent under the New Democratic Party government and a diminution of activity under the Conservative government. That will be the inevitable result.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister when she first posed this question said that the Manitoba Government has a policy of taking 50 percent of all of the ore that is explored — I remember the word — all of the ore that is explored in the Province of Manitoba, meaning that somehow we were getting 50 percent of INCO's ore, 50 percent of Sherritt's, 50 percent of Tantalum's, 50 percent of Hudson Bay's. That is absolutely untrue. The Minister is not a liar, no, the Minister is ignorant, she is not a liar. It is absolutely untrue. None of the previously explored ore, none of the existing mining properties are in any way affected by that program. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the taxation program, not one additional cent in incremental taxes has been paid under the New Democratic program as distinct from Ontario where they put on a stupid tax, a Conservative tax, which taxed in accordance with bulk income rather than in accordance with investment.

That's why, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the issue. The Minister can go around believing, if she . . . to live we can call her "Norma in Wonderland" if that's what she wants, if she wants to walk around in the wonderland of belief that mining activity in the production end has been reduced in the Province of Manitoba because of the New Democratic Party government, then I can feel sorry for her. I don't have to agree with her, I can feel sorry for her. If she wants to believe that exploration has gone down, she is dead wrong, exploration went up.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to deal with some of the issues before us rather than getting into name calling. We were discussing previously the question of minimum wage and the Minister did indicate to us that the Research Division had made some input into the policy decision on minimum wage. The Minister also went on to say that one reason she thought the minimum wage should be kept low in Manitoba because it was very important that we have a very low wage because in this way we might attract new industry to the Province of Manitoba. I say, well what evidence has her Research Division given her to prove that there is some correlation between the minimum wage and the attraction of industry to the Province of Manitoba because as the Member for Inkster indicated, that is a wild notion, it's an absolutely wild notion to think that there is some correlation, even a shred of correlation, between the rate of economic growth, the rate of employment and the level of the minimum wage. The fact is that if you want to look around this country, you will find that the province that has the lowest minimum wage in Canada, namely Newfoundland, has a minimum wage of \$2.50 an hour and it has the highest degree of unemployment in this country of ours. Not only has it got the highest degree of unemployment, but it's got the worst economic

mess, I think, of any province in the country. The growth rate just isn't there; there's poverty all over the place and they have the lowest minimum wage.

Then you look to our sister provinces to the west of us, Saskatchewan, Alberta. Saskatchewan has a minimum wage of \$3.15; Alberta has a minimum wage of \$3.00 per hour. Those are about the two highest, I believe, maybe short of B.C. No, they're only after Quebec. Saskatchewan and Alberta have the two highest after the Province of Quebec. It's these provinces that are the growth provinces. It is these provinces that have the lowest unemployment in Canada. They are the fastest growing economies and they have the best employment situation and yet they have a minimum wage that far exceeds that in the Province of Manitoba.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no correlation between the minimum wage and the amount of economic expansion that might take place in an area. I think that's another wild notion that the Minister of Labour should disabuse herself. I won't call her a liar in this . . . I would say, too, like the Member for Inkster, that she's rather ignorant in this whole affair and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister should sit down with her Research Division and see what are the factors that affect the rate of economic expansion in the Province of Manitoba. What is it that creates industry? What is it that causes employment opportunities to expand? It's not by having or trying to have the lowest minimum wage in Canada, that's for damn sure. But the Minister of Labour is determined that we're going to compete with the Province of Newfoundland to be about the lowest minimum wage province in Canada and I can assure you, if there is any correlation, the correlation is the reverse and that is, we'll end up with the highest amount of unemployment.

But, Mr. Chairman, to look at some examples. The members have mentioned Tupperware before in this committee in this particular room. They are very proud of the fact that Tupperware has come to Manitoba. Well, the fact is that Tupperware was looking at Manitoba for a year and a half, possibly two years. And, Mr. Chairman . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. Can members permit the Member for Brandon East to carry on without interruptions please.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure you will recognize the other members when they want to speak.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that Tupperware was looking at Manitoba for a long long time and the interesting thing is that the other province that they were concerned with, they were very very seriously looking at, was Alberta. The fact is that even though it had a Conservative government, even though it had presumably a government that was friendly to industry and had all the other presumably good features to attract industry, they made up their minds some time back that perhaps Manitoba was the area. The fact is that the minimum wage, as I understand it, was not a serious factor in their decision. It was not a serious factor, and I think if you look at any significant development that has occurred here, if you look at the industries that have come in, if you look at the industries that have left, it's not because of the minimum wage.

I urge the Minister of Labour not to go around in the Alice in Wonderland atmosphere of thinking that there is some correlation between minimum wage and economic expansion. The sooner she disabuses herself of that wrong notion, of that false idea, the better off she will be, the stronger she will be as a Minister and the greater the contribution she can make to the government of this province. There's nothing better than knowing what is real out there. I urge the Minister of Labour to maybe sit down with her Research Division and find out what the reality is between the minimum wage and the rate of economic expansion. I think she'll find, in due course, after some study, that it isn't what she thinks it is and the sooner she disabuses herself of that false notion, of that myth — I would call it a myth — that she's imbued with, the better off we'll all be, including those people on the minimum wage.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to another topic, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the Research Branch of the Department of Labour and ask the Minister of Labour as to what type of research the Department of Labour is undertaking or is on an ongoing basis dealing with women, the disadvantaged, the minorities within the labour force, what kind of work is being done within the Department of Labour to try and improve the employment opportunities, the conditions for the women within the labour force, for the handicapped, for the disadvantaged groups? In light of the phasing out of the Equal Opportunities Branch of the Department of the Civil Service Commission which the Minister of Labour has indicated has been transferred to the Department of Labour, could the Minister indicate what research capability and capacity and work is being done in this area by the Department of Labour?

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't recall ever saying that it was transferred to the Department of Labour. That is still under the Civil Service in conjunction with the Women's Bureau and it will come up under the the Civil Service Estimates.

**MR. URUSKI:** Could the Minister indicate what work, answer the first part of my question, what work and what research is being —(Interjection)— Oh, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labour has a Women's Bureau. The Minister of Highways says it's not under her department. Mr. Chairman — and I raised it before — the Department of Labour deals with members within the labour force, whether they be male or female, and I want to know what kind of work, what kind of research there is in attempting to improve the availability and the opportunities for women, disadvantaged groups and the handicapped within our economy. Does the Research Branch play a role in this area?

**MRS. PRICE:** I just mentioned to you, the research and the particular area that you're referring to comes under the Civil Service in conjunction with the Women's Bureau. It will be in my Civil Service Estimates.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass. 2. Workplace Safety and Health.

**A MEMBER:** Committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, do you want to pass the Minister's compensation? Okay. 2. Workplace Safety and Health: (a) Administration, Research and Education, (1) Salaries.

**MR. EVANS:** I move the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion by the Member for Brandon East that the committee rise.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, if the committee wishes to rise, that's all right. If you're going to have a motion that's going to be voted on. . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I know that but I've got to find out whether the . . . The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, the point speaks to the motion. The point is that this is a very large . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You can't have debate on this. Is the motion still being put forward? You were interrupted by your House Leader and I'm not sure whether you have a motion before me or not.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, it seems to me that this is a logical place to stop for the night because we're getting into a very big area and it could lead to a lot of additional debate. There are a lot of experts, it seems, on Workplace Safety and Health.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it the wish of the members to have committee rise? Is there any opposition to it? If so we have to take it into the House for a vote. Is somebody asking for Yeas and Nays? The Minister responsible for Housing has asked for Yeas and Nays.

**MR. EVANS:** Forget it then if we have to have a vote.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Does the Member for Brandon East wish to withdraw the motion?

**MR. EVANS:** I prefer to withdraw the motion on an indication from the Chair how long this committee will be sitting?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I can't give you that. Maybe we can ask one of the senior members of the government side, and maybe they can give you an indication, I can't. I'm just here at the will of the committee.

The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, we have been able from time to time to sort of say when we're going

to quit. If there's no inclination to say so, then we know that we're in for a long night; if there is an inclination to indicate that at some stage we're going to quit —(Interjection)— Well no. Shall we stay until 11:00 or what? Okay, let's keep going.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that the Minister of Labour has indicated that she's prepared to carry on for some while yet, and the other House is still sitting. We hadn't fixed a time at which to quit, but there isn't unanimous approval to quit, so I just suggest we continue on for awhile, and we'll see when the other House committee rises.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, it's up to the members of the committee, it's really up to the Member for Brandon East. If he want his motion voted on, I'm going to have to call in the members, and if he wants to withdraw it otherwise.

**MR. EVANS:** Okay, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

**A MEMBER:** Yeas and Nays.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yeas and Nays. Call in the members. *Committee retired to the House.*

### SUPPLY — DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR (Cont'd)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Lady and gentlemen, we have a quorum. We are on a new item, Workplace, Safety and Health 2.(a)(1) Salaries — the Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This being a new reorganization, and a very complicated area, I wonder if the Minister would give us first of all the SMYs that are involved in the Salary area, and why the reduction, also a brief outline of how the new reorganization is going to work with the reduction in staff?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I'd like to start out by telling you my staff man years. We have a total approved positions of 42, we have 36 right now and we have 6 current vacancies.

**MR. FOX:** That's under the first item, Salaries, which is \$38,000?

**MRS. PRICE:** The salaries there are for four positions, there are two that are still vacant.

**MR. FOX:** So actually, there are only two filled at the present time, is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Pardon me?

**MR. FOX:** There are only two filled at the present time?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. FOX:** That's a reduction from how many?

**MRS. PRICE:** It isn't a reduction, well, they were vacant when I took over, and they haven't been filled.

**MR. FOX:** Well, there was an allocation of \$77,900 the previous year.

**MRS. PRICE:** That was including the other two vacancies that have not been filled.

**MR. FOX:** So therefore it wasn't expended. Is that what the Minister is saying?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, right.

**MR. FOX:** Can the Minister tell us the kind of research that is taking place at this area, in respect to the research that was taking place under General Administration?

**MRS. PRICE:** The research that has basically taken place in the Workplace Safety is of a technical nature to do with the occupational safety and the different types of commodities that are handled and environments that people are in.

**MR. FOX:** And the Minister says now two people are there and there are two vacancies.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. FOX:** Is she looking forward to filling those vacancies or is that a freeze?

**MRS. PRICE:** Not at this time. Well, we are not anticipating that we are going to fill it at this present time.

**MR. FOX:** So, therefore, the Minister feels that two people can do the job adequately at the present time in this particular new technological area?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, what we're doing at this time is studying the department very closely to see whether we require any more at this time. We haven't felt that at this particular time it is necessary but if we find in the future that it's necessary then it will be filled.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet, followed by St. Johns and Transcona.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would explain to us the difference in the requested amount from last year?

**MRS. PRICE:** Pardon me?

**MR. USKIW:** The difference in the vote from last year to this year? There's a . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, last year was only part of the year. The Workplace Safety just came into play for about three-fourths of the year, and that's why there's a difference of approximately \$180,000.00.

**MR. USKIW:** Okay. (a) Would the Minister then initially give us an idea of government policy with respect to Workplace Safety and Health and the legislation that was passed in that connection? As a starter can we have a policy statement as to where we're heading with respect to that question?

**MRS. PRICE:** We are in exactly the same position we were when we took over in October. We haven't made or are contemplating at this time any changes in The Workplace Safety Act.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, then I would like to ask the Minister to explain to us more fully here the problems that gave reasons to the director of that particular legislation to resign his position? As I recall, during questions in the Legislature, we were not able to get the answers to that question, or at least not at any length. Perhaps the Minister will use this opportunity to indicate to us just what the problem was.

**MRS. PRICE:** I can't really tell you why he resigned. I know the excuses that he gave to the news media. But while we are on the subject I would like to tell the Member for Lac du Bonnet that I asked the director repeatedly for a copy of a Plan of Implementation for The Workplace Safety Act and the regulations because I felt that since it was a new Act that had only come into effect a couple of months before that it was important that the implementation be proceeded with, and when he left us a few weeks ago, he still had not given it to me, even though I had asked him numerous times for it.

**MR. USKIW:** What is the intent of the department in that connection, Mr. Chairman, to fill that position, or has it been filled?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's been bulletined now. It took a little while, because it had never been bulletined, so it took a little longer, but the Civil Service has completed it now and it will be ready to be

**MR. USKIW:** Is it possible to determine the credentials that are required for that particular position, Mr. Chairman? Can the Minister indicate to us what type of person she is looking for to fill that position?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I think basically one of the most important things will be somebody with a good administrative background, because he or she will have the technical advisers around them, but I think it's very important that they have a very good administrative background, as well as a good working knowledge of the Workplace and Safety.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, then in that connection perhaps she can illuminate for us just what she would be looking for from this operation and from the director in terms of performance, because this is obviously going to be a very sensitive area, and depending on one's bias will be determined the nature of the enforcement of regulations, the kind of attitude on the part of the various companies that will have to adhere to those regulations. All this is very important on the basis that we should know just what the attitude is in the first place, that's if it's going to be one of public protection, then that's fine, if it's going to be an attitude of half the time looking the other way because it may be expensive for a certain company to make improvements in order to bring about safety measures that would conform to the regulation, then, of course, that's another position.

What is going to be the bias of this person that this Minister wants to hire, to appoint? Is it from the point of view of safety or is it going to be a P.R. position, because there's quite a difference, Mr. Chairman. I say that in light of what has already happened under that legislation and I think the Minister knows what I'm talking about.

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't really know what he's talking about.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I will then illustrate.

**MRS. PRICE:** I mean, you said, "She knows what I'm talking about," I'm afraid I . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we have had since the change of government a measure of interference from the Department of Labour with respect to certain regulations, certain requirements with respect to certain operations in Brandon, so that's why that question is extremely important. If we're going to fill that position with one that down plays the importance of safety measures of proper regulations where there is possible occupational hazards, then we know what to expect. If we are going to have someone appointed that is going to emphasize the safety angle all the way, then we know what kind of person we want as well, and to date the impression I have, because of the intervention of the Minister in a couple of cases, I am of the impression that this government is not intending to live up to the regulations per se, or within the spirit of those regulations, and I think that's important for us to know.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, firstly, I would like to assure the Member for Lac du Bonnet that not only I but the government are very concerned about the safety of the people, and I think in spite of what you might feel towards the employers as businesses, they are just as concerned about the safety of the people. They don't want any accidents in their workplace any more than we want to see them happen.

With regard to Brandon, that has no connection with the Workplace Safety. That comes under the Mechanical Engineering Department and it didn't come under the . . .

**MR. USKIW:** But, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it all comes under the Workplace Safety legislation. I don't believe there is an inconsistency there whatever. The Act applies to all jurisdictions.

**MRS. PRICE:** I'd also like to mention that there was 320, I believe, companies were told that they had to have safety committees instituted in their workplaces, and they immediately went on to fulfill this obligation, and I think that probably 99 percent of them have been done to date. I am just pointing this out to show that the employers do feel that they have a responsibility and a concern.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Meer for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, this person that resigned and the Minister doesn't know why he

resigned, was his salary under this Item 2.(a)(1)?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, it was.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, I assume that the Item 2. (a)(1) refers to the responsibility for the entire Paragraph 2, that is all the sub-headings, (b), (c), (d), etc.?

**MRS. PRICE:** Correct.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, the administration then of the entire Mechanical Engineering, Industrial Hygiene, Fire Prevention, Safety and Health and Occupational Medicine is being administered under two people, and that is the intention of the government; is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's under more than two people.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Could the Minister clarify that?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes. The Workplace Safety has their separate director, Mechanical Engineering has theirs; the Fire Prevention has theirs.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, I must have misunderstood the Minister. I thought that we said that the person under 2.(a)(1) was in charge of all of these other departments; that is not correct.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I didn't say that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, to whom does whoever it is that's responsible for Mechanical Engineering, to whom does that person report?

**MRS. PRICE:** To myself.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Directly to the Minister?

**MRS. PRICE:** Or to the Deputy, but even if he just . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Directly to the Deputy.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mm-hmm.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Not through the administrative heads?

**MRS. PRICE:** No.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** What description? is the staff

**MRS. PRICE:** Did you not get one of these organizational charts? I handed them out the first day. It'll show you the Workplace Safety and how it filters.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The Workplace Safety and Health Division. Well we have the Executive Director of Workplace Safety and Health is responsible for Administration, Research and Education unit. How many people does that consist of?

**MRS. PRICE:** Oh no. He has more than that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, let's look at that. We have here your form, your charts, Workplace Safety and Health Division, Executive Director, he will be paid under 2.(a)(1); is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** I gave the numbers at the beginning. The total approved was 42; we have 36 existing and 6 vacancies.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** All right, Mr. Chairman. 2.(a)(1), \$38,500. I assume that that is for 4 SMYs of which only 2 are filled; is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, it's for 2 SMYs.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, the 2 that are vacant — the Minister I thought said four, two of which were vacant.

**MRS. PRICE:** I said the two were vacant when I went into this portfolio, and . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And they're not included under 2.(a)(1)?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, they're not.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So there are two salaries there, one of which is the Executive Director. Is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The other is probably a secretary.

**MRS. PRICE:** A secretary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Then we get down to Administration, Research and Education unit. Where does that come in under this resolution?

**MRS. PRICE:** Are you referring to 2.(a) Administration, Research and . . . ?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, no.

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, I don't know what you said.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm now looking at the organizational chart provided by the Minister, who shows that the Administration, Research and Education unit reports to the Executive Director of the Workplace Safety. I'm asking where is that shown in the Estimates, that unit, Administration, Research and Education?

**MRS. PRICE:** That's in 2.(a).

**MR. CHERNIACK:** 2.(a)(1)?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, but we only have the Director and his secretary.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, but we didn't fill the other two positions. They weren't filled when we came into office and we are not contemplating filling them at this time.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, does that mean that this organizational chart is incorrect in that it shows an Administration, Research and Education unit which does not exist and is not intended to exist?

**MRS. PRICE:** We are looking at it and at this point we're deciding whether we need to have these people. They have been operating without it; we've been operating quite well, and we are going to keep monitoring it to see if we require two more people. If we don't, they won't be filled. If we do feel that we do need to have the additional vacancies filled, then they will be filled.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, out of what budget will they be filled? Where will the money be found?

**MRS. PRICE:** They're not funded at the moment but if they need to be filled, we have the assurance that they can be.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, after seven months in government, we are told that there is no Administration, Research and Education unit. We are told there wasn't any for all of the seven months; we are also told that there is no provision in the Estimates or in the SMYs for that unit, and yet it is being shown on the organizational chart. Is this an organizational chart of what may

be or what is expected to be?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, a clerical person is a part of this Research and Education unit. The Workplace Safety that you see up at the right-hand corner of that Administration is the whole Workplace Safety complement of 42 people and the Administration and Research here is the two people that we have at present, down below.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I'm not clear.

**MRS. PRICE:** The Workplace Safety and Health Division Executive Director, that is the whole complete department. Down below you'll see that it has Administration, Safety and Health, and Industrial Hygiene, Occupational Medicine; that is, Workplace Safety broken down into those four divisions.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I understand what the Minister is saying, but I have to point out to the Minister that the Safety and Health is shown as Item (e); Industrial Hygiene is shown as Item (c); Occupational Medicine is shown as Item (f), and nothing is shown for Administration, Research and Education unit as far as I can see.

**MRS. PRICE:** Research and Education is shown in 2.(a); in the Salaries it's \$38,500 is the salary for two people. There is the two vacancies.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, there are no two vacancies, as I understand it. I understand there are only two SMYs and only two . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** All right. We didn't refill the two vacancies that existed when we took office.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, then there are no . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** . . . There are no vacancies; there are two positions under Item 2.(a)(1), which makes sense. You've got \$38,000 for two people.

**MRS. PRICE:** Right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Therefore, am I correct in saying that that 2.(a)(1) is for the Executive Director and his secretary?

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, will the Minister agree that there is no provision, either in SMYs or in money, for the Administration, Research and Education unit? If she'll agree on that, then we can move on.

**MRS. PRICE:** There isn't any at this time, but as I say, I have the assurance that if we find that we need somebody, then we are going to be able to fill it, but at this particular time, we don't see a necessity of it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So now, Mr. Chairman, we do know, then, that this organizational chart which the Minister distributed, is not really an actual chart in relation to this unit, which has not yet been determined.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, it is.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, how can it be an organizational chart if the Minister says there are no SMYs, there's no money, there are no bodies filling the job, and she hasn't decided whether or not to provide for it?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, the Administration, Research and Education here is the two people that are on there, the Director and the secretary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So, the Minister is telling us that the provision of \$38,500 is for an Executive

Thursday, June 8, 1978

Director and his secretary, so it means the Executive Director alone, who will be responsible for safety and health inspection amounting to \$500,000, Industrial Hygiene amounting to over \$100,000, Occupational Medicine amounting to over \$150,000, which I think is probably around \$800,000, and that person responsible for those three divisions is also the Administration, Research and Education unit. Is that what the Minister is telling us?

**MRS. PRICE:** We also have people that are in charge of each of those departments that look after each separate department; they're the Industrial Hygiene, the Safety and Health and Occupational Medicine. There are people in charge of those departments that come under the Director of the Workplace Safety.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well that's clear, but those three people report to the Executive Director, don't they?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And he reports to the Deputy Minister?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** But he is also the Research and Education unit.

**MRS. PRICE:** Not really. He doesn't do that. We have an administrative officer, and we have clerical staff in the other divisions that are utilized in administering this Act.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, is the Minister saying that Research and Education is not being handled under 2.(a)(1) but is handled by people in other branches?

**MRS. PRICE:** It is being handled under it, but with the help of other parts of our department.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it be helpful if the Minister would tell us what I believe we're finding out anyway, and that is that the Executive Director, who has not yet been hired, is going to be expected to be responsible for the Workplace Safety and Health Division and the three enumerated departments of (c), (e), (f), and is also expected to handle all Administration, all of Research and all of Education, with responsibility for Workplace Safety and Health. Isn't that the correct picture?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, it isn't a correct picture. Our Research Department and some of our clerical staff are working with them, and this is how I mentioned earlier in my Estimates, how we are utilizing other members in our department to get greater efficiency.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well Mr. Chairman, the Minister refers to clerical staff. I understand the clerical staff is indeed clerical staff and therefore does not have Research and Education work responsibility or capabilities.

**MRS. PRICE:** We have administration staff in the Safety and Health and Industrial Hygiene and in Occupational Medicine and there's considerable research being done in the Occupational Medicine.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Committee is ready to rise, and I don't want to prolong it, but I would like the Minister to agree that this blocked out section is incorrectly shown, that if the Minister wants to show the Executive Director, she can only show him in one place, not in two.

**MRS. PRICE:** Fine. Then we'll him . . . move it up for

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, the Minister agrees that the section indicating Administration, Research and Education unit under the organizational chart is non-existing as a separate unit, whatsoever?

**MRS. PRICE:** Right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's correct. Well, that's helpful, Mr. Chairman. There are more questions I'd

like to ask, but I gather there's an inclination for the Committee to rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise. The Member for St. Johns is moving the —(Interjection)—

**MR. GREEN:** The Committee can put the question, but if anybody wants a Division after the question is put — let's take a hypothetical situation, that we move Committee rise, and we win. And you can either say "Committee rise," or you can say "Division," in which case the bells have to ring, in which case everybody votes. But the question can be put the first time. The only time we have a Division, is if somebody wants a Division. So, if you had had, let us say, a majority, when Len Evans had put the question previously, then the question could have been put, and that's all there would have been to it. But if you had lost and you wanted a Division, then we would have had to go back into the House. Or either side could have had a Division.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, just to illustrate, Mr. Chairman, using the last case as an example, if the question had been put and you had said, "Motion is lost," you could still have said that you wanted a formal Division. Either side can ask for a formal Division, which means it goes back in the House.

**MR. GREEN:** Right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** My question is to the members of the Committee or to the Clerk.

**MR. GREEN:** Everybody wants to rise now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes. If the question is put now and somebody says they want a Division and the House has been closed down, what do we do?

**MR. GREEN:** Should we go into the House? Should we have them ring the bells, and have a Division?

**A MEMBER:** You can't do it in here.

**MR. GREEN:** We can do it here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Johns has moved that Committee rise. All in favour?

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin):** The Department of Health and Social Development Estimates, Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program, \$269,423,000 — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, there are two points that I wanted to discuss with the Minister.

One concerns a letter he received a couple of months ago. I don't whether he replied to it. It's a letter from one of my constituents that went to him, with a copy to myself and it concerns the proposed rehabilitation building, which was to have been built, at Grace Hospital and the construction was slated for some time in late 1977. And my understanding from the letter is that according to this lady, who is familiar with the project, she indicated that all plans were finalized and passed by our former Provincial Government, and that the commencement date was set. I would like to read several paragraphs from this letter and ask the Minister if he would respond and bring us up to date, in terms of what can be expected in regard to this particular project.

I guess the lady in question is concerned because she, herself, has a son who apparently could have benefited from this particular program. So if I could read a few paragraphs. She says:

"I feel it is only fair" — writing to the Minister — "for me to state my own personal reasons shared by many other people, as to why we are patiently waiting for this project to be under way. I have a son, who at one time in life had a promising future. He commenced college during the era of a university education being essential to not becoming a failure. We can be grateful that this thinking has changed.

"The curriculum during those years was very demanding, for example, possibly repeating a year, or worse, if a single subject was failed.

"Mid-term my son's health failed and suffered mentally. He was hospitalized, recovered and

to seek employment with no training for any special type of work. Many jobs have been held temporarily while trying to compete with skilled workers.

"This is where I recognized a need for a special kind of help, rehabilitation programs, sheltered employment, learning a trade under guidance. Only in this manner could confidence be restored to people having had a setback."

I might say to the Minister, that although this is one particular example, I have heard more recently of other people, and I think all of us are familiar with people who have suffered mental breakdowns and had breakdowns of a psychological, as well as a physical nature, which has prevented them from working. She says:

"There are so many people in this unfortunate situation who are capable of earning their own living, thereby also having a normal place in society.

"Each time a person has a relapse, a return to hospital, it is a costly process. The doctors and medical staff do wonders restoring health. I have personally seen marvelous recoveries. The social workers need special mention. Each one has an enormous caseload and is constantly trying to keep in touch with everyone, encouraging them to keep on trying to overcome their problems.

"Once again, the patient is well, filled with new hope and leaves the hospital, but what is ahead of them now? Some people are able to start over again, still with no job training. But too often the cycle is repeated over and over again. Is this not the most unfair to patient and medical staff?

Here is where a rehabilitation service would be of great help. The end result, in many cases, would be a reduction, financially, to hospitals and governments." And in conclusion she says:

"For myself, I am a Canadian citizen, born in Canada, one of the many workers whose expenses are almost the same, regardless of the variety of incomes that each one earns.

"All we want is a fair chance for ourselves, families, friends and neighbours." Signed, "Yours truly, Mrs. Ethel McFadyen of 542 Windsor Avenue."

Well, I don't know if the Minister read that letter. I realize he receives a deluge of mail and those endless thick volumes of reports, but I had a copy of that letter two months ago. I never received a copy. I don't know if the Minister wrote my constituent and I would be very interested in hearing what he would say about that project.

The second point that I wanted to comment on, Mr. Chairman, is the question of nurses, and the supply of nurses, and the danger of Manitoba nurses in relation to rating and recruiting programs going on in our province at this time. Because it strikes me that two things are happening together, which could have a very disastrous effect on the quality of nursing care in Manitoba. And that is that while the working conditions are becoming worse, the American recruiting teams are coming here with offers of better working conditions and better salaries. It seems to me that this will have a devastating effect on the nursing profession and on patient care in Manitoba hospitals.

I've asked the Minister questions about this before in the House, and it's pretty hard to simply put a few brief questions and receive a brief answer. So I ask him whether he would make some fuller comment at this particular period in time; because it is my impression and the impression of many people in Manitoba that the hospital system, the health system, the delivery system, which was carefully built up over many decades in Manitoba, is now becoming second-rate.

And we know that, for instance, at the level of service in the hospitals is not as good or not as high as it was only six months ago, and certainly not as good as it was in the past few years.

We know the stories, the horror stories, of the cuts in patient care, the story of the bed sheets and the Kleenex and the combs and all this, all because of the fact that the hospital budgets are limited to 2.9 percent. We also know previously that there were some very uneconomic uses of nursing staff in Portage and Brandon and Selkirk. I think a lot of people, Mr. Chairman, are under the illusion that you can save money by having people perform a variety of tasks; so that if you ask a nurse to scrub floors, or carry out laundry, or perform duties that she is not especially trained for, that she has not taken her training in, and so on, that we're saving money. Well, in fact, the opposite is true; that when you wind up taking people and asking them to do a variety of tasks, then you are not using them in the best and most economic way; you are wasting resources and you are not properly utilizing skilled personnel.

And at the same time that this is going on — people are being informed daily of the fact that the level of service is less than it was, or worse than it ever was — at the same time recruiting teams are coming into Manitoba. One particular group comes from Texas, and they say that they have 2,000 vacancies in the city of Houston. This article which was in the Free Press, comments that, "Local nursing employment prospects are considered dim." And an official of the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses says, "Manitoba nurses in the past have tended not to look for jobs in the U.S., that in 1976 only five of 450 Registered Nurses who graduated from Manitoba, left for the U.S.," and now we hear stories of 100 nurses making appointments and asking for employment opportunities with one particular recruiting team; and there are others that appear to

be advertising and coming to Manitoba. At the same time, the nursing schools are continuing to crank out the same number of graduates.

So I have to ask the Minister whether he approves of that. Because if the situation is bad and people are unable to find proper employment in Manitoba, then maybe what the government is doing in effect, is training nurses for jobs in American hospitals. That is very generous but it is also very costly, and I think, not a policy that the Manitoba taxpayers would favour.

I would also ask the Minister this . . . it is my understanding from speaking to a number of women in the nursing professions, that the hospitals are now favouring the green, inexperienced new graduates over the experienced professionals in the field — that given a choice many administrators, not surprisingly, are opting for new nurses without experience because of the fact that they have to pay them less money. I don't think any of us can fault the administrators for this, but it certainly, I think, has a bad effect on the level of care, and it also lessens the opportunity for employment of nurses who have five and ten years experience, and are attempting to seek employment. So those, Mr. Chairman, are my comments, and I would be very interested in hearing what the Minister has to say about the future of a Rehab Building addition to Grace Hospital, and also what he has to say about the present supply of nurses in Manitoba and the future prospects of the nursing profession.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program — pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to insert myself in a debate between the Minister and the Member for Elmwood. I know the Minister will want to answer some of the questions, but Mr. Chairman, I thought that while you were the Chairman, knowing you to be quite an impartial Chairman, I wanted to put something on the record that I know you would be very interested in.

You see, Mr. Chairman, for the last few days, it has been very hectic for me. I didn't sleep very well, my wife wanted to send me to a doctor and I had to tell her that I had been chastised by the, I think you know the Member for Roblin who usually sleeps, I mean sits up there when he's in the House, and I told her that I had been chastised and brought in for the awful things that I hadn't done for Ethelbert Plains. I told her that I had the secret service of the Conservative Party compiling a file on me, and it was very difficult to sleep with all these things pressing constantly, on me, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank the Minister because now I feel somewhat relieved. The Minister sent me an answer to a question that I had asked. I thought it was worthwhile, especially with you in the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I thought you would want to have this on the record so I'd like to read it.

Now, for a number of years, the United Church, through their Board of Missions, ran a hospital at Ethelbert. This hospital was closed in 1957, apparently because of the difficulty in retaining medical staff in the area. (2) The Manitoba Health Services Commission has no record of a current request for either a hospital or a personal care home for Ethelbert. Discussions with community officials around 1960 — the Roblin area, that's not the Commission that says that, I'm adding that, Mr. Chairman, — revolved around construction of a hospital for the area. Subsequently between 1964 and 1968 discussions with the Commission and government included construction of a physician clinic building for Ethelbert. In 1968 — again under the former Conservative Government — municipal officials felt that this approach was not feasible and the matter was dropped. (3) We had a request dated November 30, 1977 — another Conservative administration — from a Mr. W. McKenzie — that's the gentleman that sits up there — the MLA for the constituency of Roblin, to review the total lack of health services in the Ethelbert area. The Manitoba Health Services Commission staff are to set up a meeting with Mr. McKenzie — the fellow up there — as soon as possible after the completion of government's review of all construction programs. At present, there is no physician in Ethelbert.

You're really listening to this, eh, Mr. Chairman, I hope?

The majority of the residents of the area, some 75 percent, use hospital and physician services at Dauphin, which is approximately 37 miles away. Winnipegosis hospital is somewhat closer, but is almost never used by Ethelbert residents. Public health nursing services are provided by a nurse working out of Dauphin, who attends the area approximately two days a week.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the record should be kept clear — and mind you I think I'll probably sleep a little better — Mr. Chairman, I want to remind you you're the Chairman. —(Interjection)— On a point of order, Mr. Chairman? Do you want me to change places with you? —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, I want clarification of the document that has just arrived on my desk.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, a point of order, can I ask the House Leader if the Chairman usually. . . —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** . . . I've received this record from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Excuse me, should I sit down and you stand up while we have this exchange, Mr. Chairman, or what?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, I wonder how this document arrived on my desk. May I ask the Committee, did it come from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or from the Minister? Thank you, just for the record. Thank you, carry on, proceed.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You had me scared again. I thought there was some other sinister plot that you were going to have, Mr. Chairman, to have me tarred and feathered again. So, I haven't been sleeping too well and I didn't want this . . . —(Interjection)—

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the episode of the other evening would show that this is not the way that you run and build hospitals. This is why it would indicate also the importance of a Commission who doesn't deal in partisan matters, but also in the need and the feasibility, and also the request of the people of an area to build a hospital and personal care homes.

Somebody said it was a cheap shot. I don't think it's a cheap shot. He can stand up any time he wants. I thought a few nights ago was a pretty cheap shot. If I can't have fun when I want, it's too bloody bad, Mr. Chairman.

The thing is, this is not the way to build and I don't think that these people will get a hospital when there's already a freeze in other areas. So, Mr. Chairman, I think that the records should be set straight, and I hope it ends.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

**MR. DOMINO:** TVHANK YOU. I was listening to what was said by the Member for Elmwood, and I was very disappointed in the tone of his remarks.

I find, generally, that he's one of the more responsible members of the opposition and one of the more experienced members, but I think he is succumbing to the temptation that we've so often seen the members of the opposition, in recent months, succumb to and that is of scoring the cheap, easy political point; and that is playing on the natural anxieties and fears that many people have concerning health services.

The health care is very important. It's a very emotional thing to many people, especially as they grow older, and especially people who, for one reason or another, have reason to doubt the soundness of their own health, which includes most of us at one point or another. We've seen this, I think, over the last two months and I don't think it's a credit at all to the members of the opposition. I think it's not in the interests of the people of Manitoba at all.

We've heard the stories of the bed sheets, unsubstantiated stories of the horrible bed sheets; we've heard — and this from the former Premier, himself — about the two meals a day, the story in Portage la Prairie, which was later on retracted and changed but still the effect was met. —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of privilege.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes. The honourable member says that there was a retraction. There most emphatically was no retraction. In fact, there was corroboration by the authorities themselves, that in fact they had gone to this new schedule of meals. Whether that's right or wrong is a separate point. But there was no retraction.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster on the same point.

**MR. GREEN:** On the same point, on the previous sentence. Any remarks made with regard to bed sheets were fully substantiated by the Minister himself. There was nothing said about bed sheets that was not substantiated by the Minister. .

**MR. SCHREYER:** I heard that was Monday, Tuesday . . .

**MR. DOMINO:** . . . I think the honourable members opposite protest a bit too much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, we'll talk about it then.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would advise the Committee, in my opinion, it's debatable, and I think I'll ask the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to proceed. It's still a debatable point.

**MR. GREEN:** But it's not retractable.

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Chairman, let me rephrase what I was saying. Both of those matters, the bed sheets and the two meals a day, were brought up and I don't think they were brought up in the proper spirit. The way they were mentioned in this House is . . . —(Interjection)— We heard the charges made, or the questions asked, and the innuendos left, and then we saw the headlines in the papers and the stories on the radio and the television, and then when it was all cleared up it was found out that, for instance, the Portage la Prairie two meals a day story; nothing at all to do with restraint; indeed a program that was conceived and thought of under the previous administration.

We heard about lights being out in the hospitals, this was the Member for Ste. Rose, about people starving in hospitals; now we hear about the threat of all the experienced nurses leaving and experienced nurses being laid off. All we get, we get continually, scare tactics; we get the opposition attempting to play on the emotions and the fears of, in many cases, ignorant people. They have to depend upon us; and this process here is to enlighten them and to offer advice. But rather than using the Estimates procedure and the question period in this House to obtain information, to provide the people with more information, to legitimately provide some constructive criticism, we find the members opposite following the Member for Inkster's advice, scoring those points, helping to find those votes so they can be returned to their offices next time. Nothing at all to do with improving the services provided to the people in this province; nothing at all to do . . . —(Interjection)— That's a matter of opinion, your opinion.

**MR. GREEN:** That's right. That is my opinion.

**MR. DOMINO:** Now I think that, again, we have to remember what is being said. We have to keep all this in context. I have suggested, at another point in the history of this Legislature a few years ago when there was much discussion of health services and there was a lot of talk about reduction in services, the Member for Seven Oaks, when he was Health Minister in 1974, he talked about this very same kind of tactics that we used at that time, he referred specifically to the Leader of the Liberal Party, at that time, and he said: "We've witnessed attempts by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party, in particular, to create an atmosphere of hysteria using grand and eloquent terms such as crisis and irresponsible, to describe the apparent situation in Winnipeg in regard to hospitals." The same sort of terms we're hearing now. I would suggest, it wasn't proper then — and I wasn't here at that time, but I wouldn't have got up and used those kind of tactics — and I don't think it's proper now.

Then we heard from the Member for Elmwood just a little while ago when we were talking about nurses in the province, of nurses finding jobs and the situation with out-of-country and out-of-province recruiters coming in and recruiting some of our nurses. I'm not all that old and my memory is not all that good, but I remember the headlines on several occasions and several different years back, when this was the normal situation, and the Member for St. Boniface, who was then Minister of Health in 1976, in response to a question asked concerning jobs for graduating nurses and jobs for other people in the medical profession in this province, he said:

"I might as well tell you right now that my first priority is not to try and find positions or to make up positions to make sure that all the people in the health services field will be employed." —(Interjection)—

I am sure that our present Health Minister does believe it; and not only does he not say it — he's acting that way — the No. 1 objective of the government and the government service, has to, at all times, provide a service to the people in the most efficient way we can. It's not an employment agency, it's not a place where those who can't be hired or who can't find jobs anywhere else are all going to be hired on and added to the public payroll. I think we should all consider this and we should keep that in mind when we're discussing these Estimates.

We should be careful not to take the cheap, easy political points at the expense of constructive and reasonable criticism. I think, whenever faced with reasonable criticism, the Minister of Health has responded; he's admitted when he was in error; he's admitted when the opposition — when they were the government — have provided programs and services; or when they've acted in a

responsible way he's given them full credit; and it's not becoming of the opposition and it's certainly not fair to the Minister, to attack him with things like this, because it's not fair criticism, not fair at all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Chairman, I want, without taking too much time of the Committee, to demonstrate to my young friend, the Member for St. Matthews, two things.

He has, himself, raised the question about keeping things in proper context and in proper perspective and also he has talked about fairness. Now, with respect to each of the two points, let us look at the following facts.

Of course, it is always a temptation for any opposition party to tell the government of the day, whatever the department under consideration may be, that whatever they're doing isn't good enough. And, indeed, if my honourable friend wants to go through the pages of Hansard for the past several years, he will find that those of my colleagues who had responsibility as Ministers of Health at the time, were under criticism during questions period — by way of question and presumably innuendo — and during consideration of Estimates.

My colleagues were under fire because it was alleged that there was a shortage of acute care beds; that there was an insufficiency of personal care facilities; and because allegedly doctors were leaving the province to seek greener fields, and so on and so forth.

In the meantime, the Estimates of the Department of Health and Welfare of the Province of Manitoba were — I think it would be fair to say — not lavish but they bore some semblance of relationship to the rate of inflation that was going on in the country; indeed, because we did try to ensure that there was no excessive spending or fat — to use a colloquial term — in respect of this very large department, which accounts for more public spending than any other department of the Crown.

I think it's fair to say that in retrospect we can now see that, indeed, there was no excessive spending or fat; indeed, because my honourable friends opposite assumed there was and made a lot of assumptions about it and a lot of election noise about it, they now find that in attempting to exercise, or practice restraint, that they are practising restraint from an already relatively restrained base; and instead of cutting fat they are, in fact, cutting flesh and bone.

But surely it is a matter of elementary fairness and intellectual honesty to acknowledge that when a Department of Health of this or any other province, is attempting to keep a 6 percent or 7 percent growth ceiling, in any given year, at a time when inflation is 8 percent or 9 percent, that that is different than a province that is trying to put a lid, or ceiling, of 2.2 or 2.9 — whichever you like — arbitrary limit on departmental spending increment, when the inflation rate is in the order of 7 percent or 8 percent.

I mean, as a matter of elementary fairness and common sense and intellectual honesty, one has to acknowledge that simple fact. My honourable friend, the Member for St. Matthews, if he isn't prepared to acknowledge that, then he should be the last one to rise and talk about fairness, or about cheap political shots. I mean, anybody who is not prepared to acknowledge that there is a substantive difference between a departmental increase of six percent or seven percent in the face of an eight percent inflation, as compared to a 2.2 or 2.9, or even 3 in the face of a seven or eight percent inflation, is just obviously talking for the sake of talking.

Now it has captured attention elsewhere. I don't know if he was in the Chamber the other day, but we had occasion to table, for the record, an article from the Regina Leader Post, which quoted the Conservative leader in Saskatchewan. I think for the benefit of my young friend, I should table it again because this is not some partisan New Democrat speaking now, but the Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan. He said that the 9.5 percent increase in Saskatchewan's health budget was better than the 2.6 percent, so he's taken the median between 2.2 and 2.9, or close to the median, that it's better than the 2.6 percent increase in Manitoba, but it is still not enough. Governments which increase health budgets by only 2.6 percent don't deserve to be called governments. Colver said.

Now you see, one can become very acrimonious about these things. One thing, without taking much more time of the Committee, that is simply impossible to sit here and acquiesce to is to hear some young honourable member rise in his place and pretend, in a very glib fashion at that, that a 2.6, or a 2.9 percent increase, at a time when inflation is, what, seven, eight percent, is somehow equal effort to a six or seven or eight percent increase as in years gone by, when the inflation rate was seven, eight, nine, ten percent. I mean, that just doesn't wash.

Well, apart from that basic and rather self-evident fact, I want to also remind him that it would be educational for him to see how oppositions acted in yesteryear. If he would see the extent to which the government of the earlier years of this decade was under pressure, at a time when there

was no freeze on hospital or personal care facility construction; pressure on the government, in any case, to proceed to build more, and indeed reference was made the other night, referring to the Conservative candidate who happened to be the opponent in Rossmere, the riding which I represent, to the effect that the government of that day, just simply hadn't done enough in the way of personal care home construction.

Lo and behold, we now find that after these questions in the early '70s and the mid '70s during the Question Period, leaving the insinuation that there was a crisis of shortage of hospital beds and of personal care beds, we now find a freeze. My honourable friend will have some difficulty in finding the perspective or the context for all that.

I don't think that I need say much more, except to ask him to do some research on his own in terms of keeping the historic record clear, and also it will help him to maintain a better perspective.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program — pass — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I would think that about now the Minister of Health is saying to himself, with friends like the Member for St. Matthews, who needs enemies? I was prepared, or just about prepared, to put the bed sheets to bed. But the Member for St. Matthews is going to cause the record to be clear again. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, no allegations were made with regard to bed sheets, except by the Minister of Health. The question was asked, can the Minister of Health substantiate, and I'm paraphrasing, whether certain hospitals have resorted to changing sheets once a week? The Minister of Health got up and said that he does not believe that to be the case. The Leader of the Opposition then got up and asked, would it be satisfactory if it was the case? The Minister of Health said, "It would be totally unacceptable." So the allegation that the change of sheets, once a week, is unacceptable, and not acceptable to the Minister, was made by the Minister of Health. I then asked, what is one to do when one has a complaint? that a woman was in the hospital from the 12th of April to the 19th, had an operation on the 13th, had her sheets changed on the 14th, continued to be on that sheet until the 19th when she left, and the sheet was not changed between the 14th and the 19th?

Mr. Chairman, was that unsubstantiated? Was that unsubstantiated? Did the Minister say it was unsubstantiated? Did the Minister say it was a crank who said that? The woman was introduced to him, taken to his office; he subsequently spoke to her by telephone; he said that what she said was correct. TF300

In doing so, Mr. Chairman, he tripped over himself four or five times. That's not my fault, that's his fault. He said he went to the hospital and found out that the sheets were changed Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. What did the Member for St. Matthews think when he said that? He thought what all of us thought. He thought what the Member for River Heights thought, that the sheets were changed four times a week. —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. Order. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** The honourable member who had the audacity, not more than ten minutes ago, to talk about unsubstantiated charges about bed sheets, now gets up and says, "I wasn't in the House at that time." —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, first of all there were no charges made; secondly, when the information which we asked to be checked was checked, it was found to be verified 100 percent. The Minister came back to the House and said the woman got into the hospital on the 12th; she had her operation on the 13th, the bedsheets were changed on the 14th; she stayed in the hospital until the 19th, and when she left on the 19th, the bedsheets were changed again. She was in the hospital from the 12th to the 19th; her bedsheets were changed once; she stayed on the same sheets, I'll count it for my honourable friend, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, for six days. For part of six days she was lying on the same sheets her sheet was changed once, and the woman next to her, who had cancer, had the same thing. So when the honourable member says, "unsubstantiated charges," he is making an unsubstantiated charge for the unwarranted and unsuccessful purpose of taking cheap political shots.

Now the difference, Mr. Chairman, is that I don't believe that cheap political shots get you anywhere. I certainly am trying to displace the government, and I am certainly trying to discredit the government — the Member for St. Matthews is helping me a great deal and I thank him for it. I also tell the Member for St. Matthews that when he was in opposition, and he was not a member of the opposition, he also believed, and I don't blame him for this, that it was his role to get rid of the then government, and despite the fact that not a single Manitoba Hydro professional engineer would substantiate the allegations of the Conservative opposition. And as a matter of fact, the Leader of the Opposition spent — and I am referring to the now Premier — spent a total day being the

only question at Public Utilities Committee, being the only question, trying to get Mr. Bateman to agree that the Hydro program had wronglly spent \$600 million. And despite the fact that this was entirely denied, completely unsubstantiated, completely unsubstantiated, the Member for St. Matthews — and that's his business — sent out literature to all of his constituents telling them that our government had wasted \$600 million on Hydro.

You know, when you talk about bed sheets once a week, substantiated, and a colossal lie, completely unsubstantiated by anybody, that \$600 million was spent in addition to what had to be spent on Hydro, we're talking about the difference, Mr. Chairman, between flying to the moon and digging a mole hole. So let the honourable member not try to put himself on some type of high plane with regard to seeking public support.

I certainly seek public support, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly make no bones about the fact that I believe that the people of this province will be much better off when we get rid of the government — the existing government. I have no bones about that at all. But I know from experience that the way to get public support is to tell the truth and to put positions properly and that is the basis upon which I am proceeding, Mr. Chairman, and I say to you that there has been nothing said about bed sheets in this House which proved to be unsubstantiated except the Minister's statements. First of all, that it would not be done and, secondly, Mr. Chairman, he said, "Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays the sheets are changed." And the reason that I can be completely unequivocal about that is that the man who sits next to him understood that to be four times a week. It turned out that he was saying that they were changed twice a week: On Mondays and Thursdays, and Tuesdays and Fridays.

Then when he got the letter — not from a crank, Mr. Chairman. You know, I want the Minister to correct me if I'm wrong that we were dealing with some strange woman or we were dealing with someone with emotional difficulties. We were dealing with, I believe, the Vice-Principal of a high school in Greater Winnipeg, a woman who in every way can be regarded as completely emotionally stable and mature, and who did right to tell a public representative that this was going on in the hospitals — did right. And if she would have brought that information to the Member for St. Matthews, he would have been incensed with it and done something about it.

So don't talk about unsubstantiated charges. The Leader of the Opposition asked a question: Have some nursing homes in Portage la Prairie changed to a program of two meals per day for weekends? That was what he asked and the answer was "yes". Now, the honourable member says that that's perfectly all right and that it can be explained, and that there is method in this type of program. That's fine; let him argue it. But the fact is that it's true and people can argue it one way or the other, and that is perfectly legitimate debate and the ones who make their position to the public appeal to them will get the support of the public, and that's what we are contesting for.

So I have participated, Mr. Chairman, merely to indicate that the suggestion that unsubstantiated charges were made is completely false. It is a cheap political point which will gain marks against the people who have made this statement — namely the Member for St. Matthews — and will do credit to the people who he is making the unsubstantiated charges against — namely the members on this side of the House — and I thank him for it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program — the Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, although I see that he is not present in the committee at the present time, and if I do so he will simply have to accept my answers as they will be recorded on the record in the transcript.

Before I do that, though, I would like to make a comment or two about the remarks that have just been made by the Member for Inkster with respect to earlier allegations made by my colleague from Wellington.

You know, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has several times said in reference to me and to things that I say, that, you know, the Minister is pretty cute; he puts things in certain ways and he is pretty cute. Well, I would defer, Mr. Chairman, a hundred times over to the extent of the mathematical spectrum to the championship and to the champion in that league, and that is the Member for Inkster. He is the most skillful twister and changer of words, and the most skillful presenter of carefully edited positions that I have ever encountered either inside or outside this Chamber. That even extends to the paid newspaper advertisements that he frequently takes to try to defend his otherwise ill-defended positions.

He carefully edits the things that he says. He says that the only person who made any allegations or made any charges was the Minister. You know, he says that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me whether hospitals in the Greater Winnipeg area had adopted a policy of changing their bed sheets once a week and that I said that that was not the case, and when I was

asked whether I would accept it if it were the case or if I would find that acceptable, I assured the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that as a general practice I would certainly not find that acceptable. —(Interjection)— The only problem is, Mr. Chairman, so far not so good. That was not the question that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me, and Hansard will show that what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me was whether, as a result of this government's restraint programs — and the clear implication was the restriction on hospital budgets — whether as a result of this government's restraint programs hospitals in the Greater Winnipeg area had changed their policy and resorted to a program of linen changes once a week. —(Interjection)— No, I didn't answer it right away. I took it as notice and I visited the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his office. The Member for Inkster doesn't know all things. The member of the opposition doesn't know all things. He knows some things.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, order please. The Honourable Minister of Health didn't interrupt the members opposite when they were addressing this item, please give him an equal chance. The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question was asked of me, and I said that I would investigate and find out but that I certainly did not accept the insinuation in the question, the insinuation being, in my view, and certainly in the view of my colleagues, and in the view of many other persons, I assure you, that rather than a question, the position was being put that government restraint and restraint programs practised by this government had forced hospitals to, in the Greater Winnipeg area, or at least one hospital in the Greater Winnipeg area, to change their policy to a once-a-week bed sheet change routine.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition did not identify the hospital. I met with him in his office, we had a courteous meeting in his office after question period that day. I asked him what hospital it was he was referring to because I said I would like to look into it. He told me what hospital it was, and I subsequently checked with that hospital and reported back to the House. But the question from the Leader of the Opposition was whether or not this was invoked as a result of the government's restraint program, and I told him, and I told honourable members opposite — but that phrase is conveniently left out of the presentation of the scenario that is delivered, over and over again, by the Member for Inkster.

The fact of the matter is that the information that I was given by the President of the Health Sciences Centre was quite clearly, and I stand by it, and the Member for Inkster can check with the President of the Health Sciences Centre if he likes, that it was not, that it was not a result, whatever the routine was, whatever the program was, I have conceded to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and to his colleagues, and to the House generally, that I apologized for having created an impression that was incorrect. I don't accept the Member for Inkster's view that everybody thought that that was the position, simply because my colleague the Honourable Minister without Portfolio thought it was, because I did discuss that fact with other members of the media and with other members of my Caucus, and was told that no, they did not draw that conclusion. —(Interjection)— The Tribune did, that's right. And when I saw it in the Tribune, I phoned the Tribune to ask that it be corrected. Because my specific answer was that the administration of the Health Sciences Centre had advised me that linen changes took place on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, but there was wide discretion. In some cases they were changed seven days a week and in some cases probably only once a week. Certainly in the Rehab Hospital with ambulatory rehabilitation cases, they are probably only changed once a week.

But we were talking about a general rule and we were talking about the government's restraint program, and my answer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was definitive then and it's definitive again today, and I stand by it. The answer was, no. That hospitals, the Health Sciences Centre and other hospitals with whom I had been in contact, had not changed the routine of their bed linen changes as a result of the government's restraint program. I was advised by the Health Sciences Centre that that measure was invoked last June, June of 1977, as a result of an internal audit, and an internal economy program, instituted by that hospital and based on a similar audit carried out by another hospital in the Greater Winnipeg area which I did not identify, but happened to be the Victoria Hospital in Fort Garry.

That is the substance of the matter, that was the extent and the truth of the exchange. I have apologized to honourable gentlemen opposite, to the press, to the general public, to my colleagues, for any incorrect impression I may have given. I must confess that I was concerned about what I felt was the imputation — perhaps I went too far in imputing it — but the insinuation, on the part of the opposition, that these things were being done as a result of a government squeeze imposed on the hospitals, and I had been assured by the hospital in question that that was not the rationale for it.

So in the heat of that exchange, if I misconstrued the information that was given me and misled

the Honourable Member for Inkster and anyone else in the House, I apologize, and I apologized at the time, but let us be, I simply say to the Honourable Member for Inkster, who is a very skillful debater and a very skillful word merchant, let us be honest about a representation of what took place and what was said in the debate, and what the question was that I was responding to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I answer the questions from the Honourable Member for Elmwood. I would like to answer, for the record, the questions that were put to me by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point. . .

**MR. GREEN:** I am just wondering whether at this point he would permit me to just ask him a question. I accept with good grace what the Minister has just said and I thank him for it. I wish it had been that way two months ago. I asked the Minister whether he would say that unsubstantiated charges had been made by members on this side with regard to that issue.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to honourable members opposite that it would not be accurate, in my view, to say unsubstantiated charges had been made. I read the questions of my honourable friend, whom I respect, whether he believes it or not. I'm referring to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, whom I respect a very great deal. But he's got a job to do as Leader of the Opposition. I read his questions as being highly cynical and highly political. Perhaps that is unfair of me, but that is the way I read them. I took them more as allegations and assertions than as questions, but I would concede the technical correctness of the point that the Member for Inkster is making.

Let me just say on that same subject, with respect to the woman to whom he refers, we had a disagreement there as to whether the timespan between her bed sheet change was four days or six days, and we'll never resolve it because I believe both sides of the story are correct. I never said to the Honourable Member for Inkster and never said in this House that her sheets were only changed once that week, nor did I say that it was untrue. What I said was, there were four days between the 14th and the 19th, the 15th, the 16th, the 17th, and the 18th, on which they were not changed. And that is correct. That is correct. —(Interjection)— Now just a minute, if the Member for Inkster will let me finish.

I don't dispute the fact that that woman who brought that case had a legitimate case, nor that she was a responsible citizen seeking to place a responsible and legitimate complaint in a responsible and a legitimate way. Did I ever dispute that point with the Member for Inkster? Never. —(Interjection)— But I do want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that as members may recall, or the Member for Inkster may have conveniently forgotten, I reported that the Health Sciences Centre had carried out a survey among its patients, to which there were 213 responses, and which included a question as to whether you were satisfied with the linen changes or not. I'm going off the top of my head, but I believe I'm correct when I recall that the responses were 207 in the positive, yes, that they were satisfied, and of the other six, three didn't answer that question, and the other three said, no, they were not satisfied. I just want the Honourable Member for Inkster to know that that particular citizen was one of those three. But taken in the broad context of the spectrum of persons who responded, I don't call that a debilitating kind of percentage.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I do want to finish with one other question. The fact that 207 people did not complain would not satisfy me. It may satisfy the Minister. —(Interjection)— If citizens did not complain, or said that they were perfectly satisfied, it would not satisfy me if that's the record of sheets. But nevertheless, I don't want to go through that.

The Honourable Minister will say that we have a disagreement as to how many days were involved. But will the Honourable Minister agree with me that I never said anything other than that she went in on the 12th, she had her sheet changed on the 14th, and she left on the 19th, and let any citizen judge what he wants, that's all that I ever said, is that not correct?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I believe, as I recall it, that that is certainly what the Honourable Member for Inkster said, but what I would like to ask him, that while I agree to that, would he agree with me that all I ever said was that there was four days in that span in which she was in there in which her sheet evidently was not changed?

**MR. GREEN:** Absolutely, so now we will let the citizens of Manitoba judge whether when they were lying on a sheet from the 14th to the 19th, how long they are lying on the sheet. You can have your four days, I'll keep my six days.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Acknowledging at all times that both dates on the end of the spectrum were sheet-changing dates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

**MR. DOMINO:** I think that it's important here and I think it's indicative of exactly what I was talking about, that when the Member for Inkster who is indeed a skillful word merchant, and a man who spent many years in this House and who makes his living by being articulate and careful with words, that when he told that story he took so much time and effort that he forgot to complete the story, to tell the whole story, and that that in a sense is misleading. He forgot to mention that indeed that policy change had occurred earlier. —(Interjection)— The Minister has already said that it occurred earlier, and I think it's a matter of fact that it has. And then he went on to talk about things like Hydro and I stand by all the statements I made during that campaign and I think that's more than can be said for all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are dealing with hospital programs not Hydro. Will the Honourable Member for St. Matthews stay with the subject matter we are dealing with, please.

**MR. DOMINO:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm also fully aware, and so are the members opposite that we shouldn't discuss Hydro, that there's an inquiry now under way, which will decide as to whether it was money wasted or not. I personally believe there was great amount of money wasted, and I think so do the majority of my constituents, because they certainly — mind you a slim majority, but enough of them to put me in this House agreed with me on October 11th. Now, I would like to —(Interjection)— and I think that it's very important — the former Premier says, "Good, honest boy". I think that I am honest at all times. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster again is speaking from his seat, suggests that I should resign if the Chairman is wrong. I've already suggested to him that if he wants to run in St. Matthews, he can, he can run against me next time. —(Interjection)— That might be an interesting — and it would be. The Member for Inkster suggested that I

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member is to take his seat. I am only your Chairman here trying to carrying on with the committee. Would the honourable members listen to the member, let him speak and then address the Chair after. I'll give you all the time. We have all night gentlemen and I'll be your Chairman as fair as I can, but let the members be heard. We have lots of time and I'll make sure that everybody will speak. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews, please.

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Chairman, I'm perfectly willing to resign if the Member for Inkster is willing to resign and we'll have a by-election. It'll be a great expense to the people of Manitoba, but I'm perfectly willing to go through that procedure. —(Interjection)— And we'll be rid of you for a while, it will be well worth it I'm sure. The proceedings of this House, — let me just go on. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I thought that the bed sheets at the . . . I've had too many by-elections, but if he wants to run in St. Boniface, I might even resign there too.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I thought the question of the sheets had been put to bed, and apparently this is not the case. I don't want to review the whole thing, but I want to continue the — it seems that maybe we'll get the full story because everybody is adding a little bit. Now, the Minister seems incensed — well, maybe incensed is exaggerated. He thought that the many comments were political. Well, that we never denied, that's the nature of this exercise here. Everything that everybody does is political, and I hope that we get that straight once and for all. But the Minister seemed to, not to accept, or to be, not incensed, but to be disturbed because of one sentence. My Leader said, is it because of the restraint? That's a certainly very normal question to ask, I can't see where anybody can be mad at that, or could take any offence in that, because of course it is. And how can the Minister say otherwise, when the Minister stands up and repeatedly says this is global budget. What other reason are they doing that for? There's no other reason. Now let me tell you the story.

First of all, I don't accuse the Minister of lying at all, maybe somebody told him that, but whoever told him that was wrong. —(Interjection)— Okay, the president, and if you want to name him by name, Mr. Peter Swerhone was wrong because that was not the policy of the former government.

The former government, and it might come as some . . . Well, first of all, it's not a policy of government, it was started under the previous government he said. —(Interjection)— All right, and that is not true. That is not true and there was false information, and again I'm not accusing him of lying, but there was false information. Now, there has been restraint put on the hospital for a long time, at different times. Two years ago, and I read, and unfortunately I haven't got this here, and I quoted from that, in fact I tried to ask a question and the Speaker told me that I was out of order and I was going to let it go, but I think now that I can't.

Now, in that year, June of 1977, the Health Sciences Centre had a lot of trouble meeting their budget, in fact they were in the hole. They had had an increase of eight percent or something like that, and the policy was very —(Interjection)— approximately eight percent and they couldn't meet that. And they tried, and different hospitals, I quoted from the Director of St. Boniface Hospital who said we'll try like hell, we'll do everything we can to do it, and it was tough. And it's natural. I wouldn't apologize for certain things, the only thing is if their standards start to suffer, I would say, just a minute, you're not cutting the right things or I've cut you to the bones and you have nothing else to do so let's sit down and have a review because I'm not being realistic. This is what I would do.

Now, before that the sheets were being changed daily. Then at that time in June, they tried different measure of changing the light bulbs, of repairing the different kind of glass if a glass was broken and so on, and they started on that day or around that day, they were doing that two months after that, they would take the top sheet — no, they would take the bottom sheet and remove it, and take the top sheet and put it at the bottom and put a new sheet, a clean sheet. That was the policy they started in that time. You have the words of Mr. Harry Heaton who works at this hospital, who is responsible for the budget, and that was one of the things he said himself in his statement. So the thing is I don't know if that is that important, if they started a couple of months before. The thing is it certainly hadn't been brought up to my attention at all. But the point is that no matter when they did it, the point is that it was because of restraint and this is exactly the debate that we have here today. We know that it's a very difficult exercise. We know that it is the role of the opposition to point out and they are going to safeguard the standards when the government is trying to save too much money, and that's our job. And that is what the opposition was doing before — I mean the government when they were in opposition. But the fact is that that is changed and there was more restraint. In those times it was 8 percent, now it's 2.2 percent. It's not even 2.2, it's 2 percent at the Health Sciences Centre.

If you have a global budget, of course that was one of the reasons. Don't think that you have to be ashamed of that if you agree that this fair. You should take all of the credit. You shouldn't be ashamed. You shouldn't say, "Well, it's not because of restraint." It has to be because of restraint. There is no other explanation. There can be no other explanation.

The Minister has said himself, also, that they are coming in with all kinds of suggestions like having the nurses be the messengers to bring stuff to the lab, and that kind of stuff. They are having all kinds of ways to save money, and that is one of them.

So I don't think there was anything wrong. The Minister was pretty peeved at the time, and he said that we ask a question and then the press will get in touch with us. Well, the Minister does that every day. And this is our day. This session is our day. That's the only thing we control, and then he can say what he wants and we are at home; we haven't got a chance. He can make any damn statement or fly any balloons and be as cute. —(Interjection)— And you're still the champion in my books. He is a debater but you're the champion when it comes to being cute. —(Interjection)— All right, but then, no, I am talking to the over-anxious rookie. No, I am talking about the over-anxious rookie over there, who seemed to think that there is no role for the opposition. The opposition should bow and congratulate. I think there is enough bragging on this side without us adding to that.1

Sure, you do a lot of good things but you pointed out very very ed fast, you point out. So we're pointing out the things that are ot quite so good that you are doing. —(Interjection)— What innuendoes? What is an innuendo in what I said that in the policy in June of 1977 they were taking the top sheet and putting it at the bottom and changing the other? That meant that a sheet was changed every day. And that's not the same thing as a change once a week. Excuse me, I shouldn't have said that. Now I am mixed up between four days and six days, and once a week. Well whatever these other people are saying.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that that correction . . . First of all, I can't see the Minister complaining at all fo the questions. I can't see the Minister saying, "Well, you didn't say allthe truth because you tried to insinuate because it was a restraint." Of course, it's the restraint and I don't know what's wrong. Are you telling the hospitals they are trying to save money and trying to live on 2 percent, or aren't you? And if you are, they are going to try everything possible and it is our duty to point out when they go too far. And this is what we have been trying to do. You know, some of the stuff seems a bit ridiculous, and it is. Can you tell me if Great-West Life would do that, for

instance? Collect all the little bars of soap and melt it like some institutions are suggesting. I'm not saying the Minister is saying that, but that is what they are trying to do and then they are going out and asking some of their staff to take a cut. You know, we covered that. It's unfortunate that we didn't go line by line, Mr. Chairman. We would have passed that, but some people that weren't here brought this thing up.

But I wanted also to add my part on the sheets. Who knows? There will probably be best sellers written about the sheets in Manitoba and I want to be part of it, too, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— No, I haven't got it here. I quoted it in the House but I could bring it tomorrow, if that's the case, but the thing was that they were changing and I want the Minister to know that this was done. You know, it could have been just as easy that it was done before. I didn't know anything about it because the Minister doesn't control the day to day routine of the hospital, and neither do I. Nobody was blaming the Minister. In fact, the Minister said that he didn't answer it once. He answered it about three or four times, but the first day he did answer because the Leader of the Opposition said, "If that is factual, would that satisfy you?" And the Minister said, "No, once a week is not good enough. I would not be happy with it." That's all he said. Therefore, you know, even if they had started before, I can't do anything if it wasn't brought to my attention and neither could the present Minister. It was brought to the attention very fairly. He said, "If that's true, I don't think it's good enough." And it turned out, at least in one case, to be true.

But I think if anybody was playing politics, it was to say, "Well, that is something that was done under the former government." Especially when it's not the case. There were some changes made there. In fact, instead of being a change every day they ended up every second day. So that's 50 percent less but it went further when their budget was cut down from 8 percent to 2 percent. And if you cut it again, they probably won't change the sheets or maybe they won't use sheets.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program—pass — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, while I've got the Minister in a civilized mood, I would like to indicate to him and ask him to consider one statement that he made. When this was raised, he said that he never said anything about the woman being a crank or anything of that nature and he didn't after he got the letter from her, after he spoke to her. But I want to remind him, and I want him to look back into the records as to what he said when the question was raised. He said, "I can't speak for every person who may have an emotional problem," or something of that nature. And I'm not giving the exact words but I am saying what the Minister said as a means of trying to deflect the issue that it might have been someone who complained to me who had some emotional type of difficulties. I am not pursuing it. I ask him to look into his own words at the time, and he will see that inference there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program — the Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I certainly recall that, Mr. Chairman, but the reference to emotional problems can be taken in various degrees and I think the honourable member would agree that there are — I think in that same reply I said to him all of us have good days and we have bad days and even the Member for Inkster occasionally has a good day, I think I said. That was all part of the same exchange and I think he would concede that some days some people are irritated by things more than they are on other days and I think he would also concede that I, that evening, sent a note over to him in the House and said, "Would you please give me the name and address of that lady and I will look into it." And subsequently, we met in the hall and that is what transpired.

Let me try to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, the answers to the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and I hope that my honourable friend from St. Boniface will tell him that that's where the answers are.

He asked about the psychiatric residence that was proposed for the Grace Hospital and that is one of the projects that has been deferred in the freeze on capital construction that has been invoked during the current lifetime of the present administration but it has certainly not been abandoned as a concept, or dropped from the list of projects that we would hope to be able to proceed with. It was a \$1 million facility, as I recall — I think a 20-bed facility — and I believe there was at least one other, and possibly two others, of approximately the same size and cost that had been proposed by the previous administration. It remains on the list of priority projects to be proceeded with just as soon as we make the decision that we have the resources available to go ahead. It is still in a top priority category, Mr. Chairman, but nothing has happened on it yet.

I am trying, as I indicated earlier in my Estimates, to free up some beds for acute psychiatric cases in existing facilities and we have succeeded now in freeing up a small number — approximately

five — in the Health Sciences Centre, which will at least hopefully accommodate part of the cutting edge of the very serious situation in the psychiatric field.

His second question had to do with the recruitment on nurses from Manitoba by United States recruiting teams. This is not a new problem, of course, Sir. It has existed in Manitoba for some time and it exists in other provinces. I am given to understand that even the Province of Ontario, which probably has in some cases wider and more attractive opportunities — at least from a commercial point of view — to offer nursing graduates than Manitoba does, is having the same kind of difficulty.

We have reached a point in our health care and health care delivery market where we don't have a shortage of nurses and yet there are still a great many young people — men as well as women — who want to take up that very laudable career and there just aren't opportunities for them at the moment. As a consequence, the Americans — as aggressive as they always have been — recognize a good opportunity when they see it and recognize a good field of candidates when they see them and are trying to lure them to jobs in the United States, with the added attractions that lifestyle in some instances, and certainly weather in some instances, and certainly money in some instances, constitute.

So it's a difficulty and a problem for us, Sir. The Task Force on Nursing Education, chaired by Mr. Justice O'Sullivan, has addressed itself in part to that problem and I will be seeking the counsel of that Task Force Report and others in the field, in the nursing profession, to see if we can't rationalize our approach in such a way as to ensure that we're not doing what the Honourable Member for Elmwood suggests we may be approaching the point of doing, i.e. training nurses for export to the United States.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a few questions. In view of the fact that a nursing home extension to the Winnipegosis Hospital had been approved two years ago and was due to proceed this spring — construction was to get under way this spring — could the Minister advise just when, since this nursing extension has a high priority as indicated by his Legislative Assistant at McCreary a week ago last Wednesday, could the Minister advise when this project will proceed? Will it be this year, next year, the year after, four years, 1980 — would that be a close estimate?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I would sincerely like to accommodate the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a definite answer but I can't give him an undertaking any more than I can give an undertaking to 56 other colleagues — and I use the term in its best sense — in this Legislature, on both sides of this Chamber. There is hardly a member in this Chamber who doesn't have an elected representative's interest in a particular project of this kind in his or her constituency. And I just am not in a position to start offering undertakings on a selective basis. I am hopeful that the Executive Council will determine, within the course of the next year, that the financial position of the province is now, in our view, substantial enough to separate various of those projects out from under the freeze and at that time I will attempt to be and the government will attempt to be completely non-partisan, completely impartial, and to be make the selections on the basis of the need in the respective areas.

The Winnipegosis Hospital extension may well be one of them. I can't give my honourable friend that promise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder if the Minister could advise how many nursing homes, that had received approval, have been frozen.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't like to be too technical about it, but I thought we had passed this appropriation on Personal Care Homes this afternoon, and we were now on the Hospital Program. But in any event, overall we're looking at — I'd have to add them up, Mr. Chairman — if the honourable member will give me one minute, I can add them up. I had a complete list of all the projects in front of me, but that includes some hospital renovations that would not be described as nursing homes. —(Interjection)— Yes, well, I have given you the total number of projects. But the honourable member is asking me specifically how many nursing homes are in the deferment category? I believe I have the answer, Mr. Chairman. It's approximately 15 — 14 or 15.

**MR. ADAM:** When the negotiations were taking place between the Winnipegosis Hospital Board

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You understand, the honourable member, that we're dealing with Hospital Program?

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm referring to the Winnipegosis Hospital which was scheduled to have a 20-unit nursing home, a combined unit. So I think that that is relevant under this item.

When the negotiations were taking place between the Winnipegosis Hospital Board and the MHSC, in regard to the extension of the hospital with a 20-unit nursing home which would be attached to the hospital, I wonder if the Minister could advise, how many acute care beds were to be closed in exchange for the 20 units, attached to the hospital?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Four, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder if the Minister could advise how many units or beds are being used at the present time, in that particular hospital, for panelled or unpanelled nursing home patients, who should be in a nursing home? And also the four units, when was this closing of the four beds, when was that to take place?

**MR. SHERMAN:** That closing was to take place at the same time that the personal care beds were to open and that was projected for March, 1980, Mr. Chairman.

The other question I'll have to defer for a minute.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, while the Minister is finding the answer for me on my last question, I wonder if it would be possible for the Minister to make available to me copies of documents relating to the negotiations for the nursing home. And I would like to know, as well, if the Minister has any information in regard to the expenditures that were expended by the hospital board and the local community in preparation for this nursing home.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I can certainly get that information, Mr. Chairman. I can't give it to the honourable member tonight; but I can get it for him. He wants to know how many patients in the hospital have been panelled for personal care beds. He wants the correspondence that took place, relative to the negotiations between the Commission and the hospital board. And he also wants me to get him information on the extent of financial commitment by the hospital board to date. They would have been borrowing the money and they would have received authorization to borrow the money, from the Health Services Commission. I can't tell him what that amount is, but I can get him all that information and send it over to him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes. Just on a point of clarification for the Minister. I asked how many patients are panelled. I would like to know, as well, those patients who are not panelled that should be in a nursing home. I would like to know, otherwise, whether there's 15 or 20 people that are occupying acute care beds at Winnipegosis, that should be in a nursing home.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, if they haven't been panelled, Mr. Chairman, they're not adjudged or adjudicated to be logical, qualifying, eligible candidates for personal care beds. They're in there for other reasons, as acute patients or post-operative patients. I mean, if I give him the information as to how many people in the hospital are panelled for personal care beds, then the answer to his other question is simply a subtraction of that number from the total number of occupied beds in the hospital, and I'll give him that information. I'll get him that information.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, surely there must be those patients who come in for emergency operations and other necessary confinement in the hospital. Then there's the other, the senior citizens, the older types who come into the hospital because there is no room to get into . . . Are you saying that all those patients are already panelled? I believe there are many in the hospitals who should be in nursing homes; they're not sick, they're just old and they can't look after themselves any more, they can't feed themselves and they're in the hospitals occupying a \$100 a day bed. Those are the people I would like to know how many there are? That's what I'm asking.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, that's the information I'm going to get the honourable member, Mr. Chairman. But those people, if they should be in personal care homes, if their doctors have adjudged that they should be in personal care homes, then they have probably been panelled for personal care beds. What the honourable member is saying to me, by implication, is that there aren't any personal care beds so they're occupying those hospital beds and I don't argue with that. Yes, I can find out how many people in the Winnipegosis hospital, how many patients have been panelled for personal care beds. The others who have not been panelled for personal care beds are not considered, at this point in their lives, to be personal care type patients.

**MR. ADAM:** When a patient is panelled and there is a \$7.00 a day per diem, does the hospital also receive — and they're in a hospital, they're panelled, and there's a \$7.00 per day diem that the patient has to pay — does the hospital get whatever charge, in addition to that, the \$100 a day or whatever the charge is, \$60 a day, in addition to the \$7.00?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program—pass — the Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The hospital isn't paid that portion on a daily basis. It's taken into account in their total budget. But the other portion that the honourable member is referring to, the portion beyond the per diem that the patient pays, is not paid to the hospital on a daily basis. It's calculated in their total budget, yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 64, 8, Hospital Program — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, we on this side are quite concerned with the direction that our health programs and the health care of the people of Manitoba seem to be going.

The government, through the Leader who is now the Premier, made it clear that as far as he was concerned we were not too rich in these programs. In fact, his term was "Don't kid yourself, this is not a new Jerusalem. We are doing approximately what the other provinces are doing."

The saving was to be done because there would be no more mismanagement, no more fat, so I think that this committee, after scrutinizing the Estimates of this department, came to the conclusion that this did not exist. There was no horror story; there was no mismanagement and there was very little fat — not more fat than you could find at any year, at any time, in a large department such as this.

It was stated that there would be consultation instead of confrontation, and that is not happening. The Manitoba Health Services Commission at such an important time as this is being completely ignored and I am talking about the commissioners. The different para-medical groups have been told that they would be taken into consideration and this discussed with them. The nursing group have been ignored. In many cases the MMA has been ignored. Certainly some of their recommendations were never discussed by the government or considered by the government.

The Minister told us that the Cabinet had information that approximately 6.4 would be the increase, to keep up with other provinces and that they chose unilaterally to bring an increase — and I'm talking now about the hospital funding — to 2.2 percent, and that was predetermined.

The Minister had made statements that there would be no backing down, that no pressure in the world would change anything, that everybody would have to live within a certain amount with the increased budget. That is 2.2, an average, some of them had less and some of them were more than 2.2 and they would have to live with this.

Now, as far as we're concerned, if other people want to close their eyes, as far as we're concerned, it is starting — not too badly yet, but starting — the standards are starting to go down. Now, the Minister said then, maybe we will give an increase because we don't want the standards to go down. But the Minister had said that in his estimation changing the sheets once a week, for instance — I am giving this example — was not good enough, but now it seems that it will be good enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is quite certain that there will be deficit also and the hospitals will not be able to live within the confines of this 2.2. So we are asked now to vote in Estimates on this appropriation a certain amount of money. We know that it is going to do one of two things. Either it is not an honest amount — that is, we know that it is going to cost a lot more than that — or if, by some miracle, the hospitals and the institutions could live within this increase, which is not an increased budget — it is a lowering, it's going backwards — well, then we definitely know that the standards will go down and go down rapidly. And it's not just for one year, it's going to take a long time to build.

We heard about the nurses, and it is quite true that it was said many times that the role of the Minister of Health, he is not the Minister of Labour. He is not trying to provide jobs. He is

there to make sure that the needs of the people, the medical care of the people of this province would be kept as high.

The concern that we have is that some of these people — the member that spoke doesn't know about that but we were really concerned because of the lack of nurses in this province. We had committee after committee, and it was only a couple of years ago that we caught up when they started getting decent wages.

And now they are not satisfied with the increase, of course. They are told that there is no money to pay the increment. They are told that they're not going to replace those that are leaving or on sick leave that they have to work harder. They are told not to bother if they didn't want to work overtime because none of them would be paid overtime and that is the concern that we have, Mr. Chairman.

Now it has come repeatedly very clear that it's dollars first, need after, if, maybe. The policy, seems it's quite clear, all this restraint is the same thing again, the restraint is some people restraining themselves, restraining so the uppercrust, the people that are more fortunate as far as getting a higher revenue, will not suffer and will be able to live even higher and get their higher increase. In fact, even in the increase, who can debate this, Mr. Speaker and again I'm making a comparison, I'm not saying that any group should not receive fair remuneration, but medical people are getting 6. something percent. I know that it equals 5.16 percent for the year, but in fact it's 6.88 percent or something, or 6.6, while people in the hospitals are asked to take a reduction. It seems that this government encourages even more disparities between the different groups and the different classes and those of different revenue. And even if the people would get the same increase, I think that 6 percent of \$60,000 or \$100,000 is a little more than 6 percent of \$7,000.00. So because of that, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a motion. Before I bring the motion I want to make it quite clear that this is not aimed at the present Minister. This is our way of protesting against what the government as a whole, he and his colleagues, he certainly shoulders part of the blame, but this is not aimed at him alone. I think that he's being quite fair and general during these Estimates, he gave us the information and I know that he's worked very hard. Mind you, part of his salary should be paid either by Great-West Life or the Conservative Party because a lot of it would be good P.R. for the department but I think he's probably one of the best Ministers and this is not aimed at him, but at the government, at his government.

I would like to move now, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the committee revert to Resolution 57, 1.(a)(1) Minister's Compensation - Salary and Representation Allowance and that in view of the irrational 2.2 funding increase imposed upon the hospitals of Manitoba, the Minister's compensation be reduced to \$1.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, members of the committee, I'm at a loss to how to deal with this matter. We're only on Resolution 64, 8. Hospital Program, Medical Program, Pharmacare, Ambulance Program, Northern Patient Transportation, Other Health Services Programs, and those items then will be deferred and we move back to Resolution 57, 1.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I am not suggesting that the others wouldn't be dealt with. I'm just saying that on this issue, we can't in good conscience pass this, we can't vote against them getting any money at all and this is our way, Mr. Chairman, to protest the action of this government. I'm suggesting that we deal with this now and then we would continue the rest of the Estimate, but we wouldn't revert back to this, this would be finished, the Minister's salary would be passed.

**MR. CHAIAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** That's a rather unusual procedure that my honourable friend is proposing. Normally the Estimates are concluded and it's laid out very specifically in our rules that when the Estimates are concluded, then we deal with the first item again. We have not concluded the Estimates. If my honourable friend is suggesting that he wants all of these items passed including Correction and Rehabilitative Services, that's fine then we can do that and go back to the Minister's salary, but until those items are passed, we do not go back to the Minister's salary and I can't understand my honourable friend proposing a motion like this thinking that we're going to not follow the rules. And the rules are laid out very explicitly. We complete the consideration of all the Estimates and then go back to the first item which is the Minister's salary and on that occasion then my honourable friend can move his motion, not before.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable House Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt about what my honourable friend says about how the items are dealt with but that's why in the motion there is a move to revert back to another

item. So what my honourable friend is arguing about is whether during the consideration of the Estimates you can move to deal with another item rather than the one that we are dealing with. I'm not suggesting that my honourable friend can't oppose it, but I fail to see whether a motion to consider one item instead of another at this moment is not a motion that can be heard. It can be voted against, in which case we would proceed with the other item; if the motion is passed then we would be able to deal with that item and vote for the motion. If the motion is opposed then we go through to the other items. — (Interjection) — It seems to me a motion to move something from one. . . If we were on Item 29 and Item 30 was next, would a motion be in order to move to skip by Item 30 for the moment and move to Item 31? That's all we're discussing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** May I have the benefit of the committee? Now, there's a lot of members in the committee who haven't heard the resolution. I'll read the resolution for the benefit of the members of committee that don't have a copy in their hands:

June 6th, 1978, Mr. Desjardins: That committee revert to Resolution 57, 1. (a)(1) Minister's Compensation - Salary and Representation Allowance and that in view of the irrational 2.2 percent funding increase imposed upon the hospitals in Manitoba, the Minister's compensation be reduced to \$1.00. Signed L.L. Desjardins.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** The Minister is playing games and so is the Opposition House Leader. . . . —(Interjection)— Well the former Minister is playing games. I refer my honourable friend to Beauchesne's Citation 242, Subsection 2: The only motion allowed when a resolution is under consideration in the Committee of Supply, is that the amount be reduced or that the Chairman leave the Chair either without making a report or report progress on certain resolutions.

What my honourable friend is proposing is that we move to a different item and I submit, Sir, that under Citation 242, that particular motion is out of order at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable House Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I think what Beauchesne's rules are referring to, and I quite agree, is with regard to changing what is proposed in the item. I think that a motion to change the order of the items from one to another is not out of order, and, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind . . . My impression is, and I've just asked the Clerk to check, that the custom of going to the salary last, is a custom. That it's not set out in the rules and therefore, we have, by general procedure, moved on to the salary last, but I don't see why we couldn't for the purposes of this motion, deal with it. Or if it's opposed, vote it down. We're not asking for a change in the items, we are asking for a change in the order in which they are being considered and let my honourable friend remember that we skipped it by, we skipped it by merely by proceeding by it and there therefore should be nothing against a motion to go back to it, which could, of course, be dealt with very quickly by a vote in the House and if it's defeated then we go on and we discuss salary afterwards.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Another point that the Clerk has drawn to my attention just for the benefit of the members of the committee. The committee has already agreed to bypass Resolution 63 in its entirety until a later date and that creates another problem for the committee, or for me as your Chairman and I hope I get the guidance of the members of the committee because it's very unusual for a committee to bypass a resolution and at a later date come back to it, and now . . .

**MR. GREEN:** We're going to come back to it eventually.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** . . .but that was on a general agreement of the members of the committee, and now by resolution, which I have in my hand, we're doing it on a vote, or a motion, so I'm at the mercy of the members of the committee. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I would simply reiterate the position that I took earlier. Notwithstanding the argument that was made by the Opposition House Leader, the fact that our rules provide for a course of action that are not contained in Beauchesne, the fact is that in Beauchesne where a particular subject is not covered, Beauchesne does cover the subject for us and under Citation 242 covers it for us.

Now if my honourable friends want to, or are so anxious to get to that vote, there's one simple way that they can do it. We can pass all the items under Item 8, we can pass all the items under Item 7 and we'll be at the Minister's salary in a hurry. As a matter of fact, if my honourable friends would all leave the Chamber, we could do that as we did in committee the other day and it will be very simple and I'll undertake to call them back, to make sure they're back in the House when

we get to the Minister's salary so that they can then deal with that particular subject. But, Sir, they're not going to go back to the Minister's salary at this particular stage and then have an opportunity to go back to the Minister's salary again because there's nothing stopping a debate when we get to the Minister's salary at this point. And then coming back under the proposal that is made by the Member for St. Boniface then after having debated the Minister's salary for God knows how long, then they expect they're going to come back here again and deal with this and then go back to the Minister's salary again. I say, Sir, that practice is irrational. It's as irrational as the motion that the Member for St. Boniface has now introduced.\$

**MR. CHAIAN:** The Honourable House Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I really regret seeing my friend get so exercised over what is a very small problem and I want to assure him that what he is suggesting is not what is had in mind. He will now have to concede that it's not a rule whereby we bypass the Minister's salary, that that is something we do by general agreement. That, therefore, there is nothing to prevent somebody suggesting that the Minister's salary come up at this time, but if what my honourable friend is worried about is that we intend to have a second debate on the Minister's salary, I think that I can undertake to him that that is not what is intended. We are not asking that this motion be debated, vote on it, if it's rejected we continue on and then come to the Minister's salary. I'm merely indicating that I don't believe that there is anything in the rules against this motion, we're just merely going back to an item that we bypassed previously. —(Interjection)— That has been under debate for some time. I'm not saying that you shouldn't do it, I'm saying that that is not our intention.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, I can assure the House Leader that we're not trying to play games. Of course, if we were going to continue item by item and discuss the Minister's . . . He tells us that this is an opportunity that we have, we know that, I wouldn't have proposed this motion at this time. Now this was an agreement that was made that normally, and it's been working well, we're not trying to change this for all time, that you keep the Minister's salary to the end. There is nothing that the committee could not do. The committee C decided to take correction after this, we had agreed. Without a motion it was agreed; we didn't need a motion at this time. It could have been done by a motion. Mr. Chairman, the motion is very clear that we debate the Minister's salary and if that is passed, there is no way we could come back to it. It is not the intention to keep playing games and bring it back. The House Leader states that we could, the only thing we can do is reduce the item. We feel that there's not enough funds. There's no damn way that we're going to bring a motion to reduce this item and this is our way of protesting until this is changed. We can't stand for that, if anything is irrational, it is exactly the way the funding was increased by 2.2 percent and I stated that this is no reflection on the Minister alone, it is collectively the government. It's not the work of the Minister, and I think that we certainly have the right to bring up this Resolution, to have a discussion on that at this time, because we feel that there is no way that the hospitals can live with this, and there is no way that they should be asked to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just one other point that the Clerk and I have been discussing — it has been the tradition of the House that when we go back to the Minister's Salary, that is the last item we deal with in the Estimates, it's the custom of the department. So then we're assuming that Resolutions 63 and 64 are completed. —(Interjections)— Order. Order please. I'm just raising these points for the clarification of the committee. I hope that we don't do something that will break a longstanding tradition of the House. So we'll clear that point up. The Honourable House Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is no difficulty with the point at all. If the motion is passed, that ends discussion on the Minister's Salary. That's right. If the motion is passed, if we reduce it to a dollar, it's finished. If we don't reduce it to a dollar, you still have to have a motion passing the Minister's Salary. And that's why I indicated earlier that we don't intend if what honourable members are worried about is that we intend to now debate the Minister's Salary, I can assure them that that's not the intention. We're prepared to have this motion proceed now. If it passes, Mr. Chairman, then the fact is the Minister's Salary is reduced to one dollar and everybody will go into mourning. If it's defeated, there still has to be a motion passing the Minister's Salary, at which point it will be debated.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster is attempting to sidetrack the whole issue, and the real issue is whether or not this motion is in order. I submit that the motion is out of order, and it should be called out of order. Citation 242 is our authority, and Citation 242(2) says, the only motion allowed when a Resolution is under consideration in Committee of Supply — and we are in Committee of Supply — is that the amount be reduced, or that the Chairman leave the Chair, either without making a report, or report progress on certain Resolutions, and the motion that is being proposed by the Member for St. Boniface says that the committee revert to Resolution No. 57. 1.(a). That is a motion that is out of order, Sir, according to our rules. It's out of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I'd just like to say, for your consideration, Sir, that the point that is made by the Government House Leader, in quoting Beauchesne, would leave you with the impression that the motion that is before you is out of order because it proposes to do something else other than to reduce an item. But if you look at the motion, Sir, it is worded so as to enable the committee to vote on doing just that, to reduce an item. But, Mr. Chairman, this was felt to be a procedure within the rules. You are rightly concerned with custom and tradition, and I suggest that one of the holiest of customs and traditions of this House or any legislative body is that any procedure that is proposed that is not in violence of standing orders and rules, if in doubt, should be resolved by ascertaining the will of the Assembly; in other words, to vote. If my honourable friends feel that that is somehow not acceptable, it leaves me very flabbergasted and surprised, but may I say in advance, Sir, that it is not irrevocable in the sense that eventually we will come to the Minister's Salary, so we do not propose to make any more difficulty for you, Sir.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just for the benefit of the members of the committee, as your Chairman, I have no problems with the reduction to a dollar, but the word that I have problems with is the word "revert" and I can't find, in any of the rules before me, or the guidance that I'm getting from the Clerk, that we can deal with that, unless by vote. I don't get guidance from the book that I'm reading from, because that word is not traditional in the standard motion.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Occasionally it falls upon great judges and jurists and great speakers and chairmen of standing committees to create a new precedent. You may have that opportunity, Sir.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I thank the Leader of the Official Opposition for his judgment. Unfortunately, I am just filling in this evening for the Honourable Member for Radisson, and I'm not as well skilled as the honourable member, nor do I have the knowledge of the Chair that he has. So I leave the matter to the members of the committee. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I submit, Sir, that the motion is out of order. It's not a question of whether or not we put it to a vote. That is assuming or accepting a motion that, in my opinion, is out of order. And I submit, Sir, that our own practices in this House, which you have recited, says that the last item on any set of Estimates is the Minister's Salary. That's No. 1. And the second one, Sir, is Beauchesne, which I have quoted on a couple of occasions and I don't intend to quote it again. But on those two grounds, Sir, I submit that the motion is out of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I, therefore, having listened to the honourable members, and having taken judgment from Beauchesne and in talking with the Clerk, have problems with the word "revert" and I therefore rule the motion out of order.

Resolution 64. 8. Hospital Program, \$269,423,000 — pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, one of the concerns I expressed when the announcement with regard to the per diem charge at hospitals for those patients who were panelled and would have to pay \$210, or \$7.00 per day if they qualified for personal care homes but were still kept in hospitals, one of the concerns I expressed was that certain types of people would be caught and hurt. The concern I had was of those people who still had spouses having to maintain themselves on other premises. I didn't have to wait long for the example to come home to me.

I received a call today from a person whose wife is in the hospital, has been for many, many months, and it appears will be there for many months to come, and certainly qualifies, and has been panelled to enter into a personal care home. He has now received a bill for \$217, there being

31 days, I guess, in the month of May. This person himself, is living in elderly persons housing, rent geared to income, income being calculated on the joint income of husband and wife. Their only income, I gather, is the pension, OAS, GIS, the Manitoba Supplement. The rent therefore, he is paying, is based on the total income of the two people, which is a family unit. Now he gets a bill from — I believe it's the Health Sciences Centre, I'm not sure — from a hospital, for \$217.00. Now there's absolutely no way that a person in this position whose income is about \$510 a month, can pay \$132 rent, including utilities, and \$217 to the hospital for his wife, who has been panelled for a personal care home.

It's this sort of dilemma and problem which I warned against when the Minister made his announcement. I bring this matter up because I feel the Minister should be apprised of this very quickly. It is a problem. I don't think he wants this to occur and to continue to occur, but it will occur again, I'm sure there are other people who have been so affected. There may not be many, but where it does occur, it creates an impossible hardship. For that person to have to pay out a total of about \$345 out of an income of \$500 is just impossible. He cannot eat, he cannot do anything.

Some solution has to be found. I will talk to the Minister privately and give him the information that I have. It is something perhaps he'd have to discuss with the Minister responsible for Housing, but I hope the Minister recognizes that the present practice, the new policy of charging \$7.00 a day has to be flexible and cannot simply be something that the hospital will apply and say, well, that's what we are required to do now. That's what we can do now, we want \$217 for the month of May, your wife has been here for that period, and we want a cheque, or if we don't get the cheque, the implication is they'll ship her out. Now, I don't think they will, but this gentleman is very scared. He's an elderly man, he's close to 80 himself.

So I make this public because I was afraid this might happen and it's happened very quickly, as I say it was within days literally of the announcement. I would like the Minister to make it known to the hospitals that when confronted with this kind of case they use common sense in sending out bills, and should discuss with the people in question whether or not the charge of \$217 a month for the month of May is not just reasonable, but makes any sense at all. Because in this case, they're creating a real hardship, economic hardship for people, and a fear. People of that age, a man who is still living on his own in senior citizens' housing, happens to be a very sick man himself, which doesn't help.

I bring this up and I'm hoping that as a result of this case, the Minister can contact the hospitals to work out a better way of doing it, some examination of the facts, of the economic conditions of the parties involved before they simply send out a bill demanding \$210 or \$217 a month.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Leaving the compassionate aspects of the question aside for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and I don't minimize them for one second, but I'd like to ask my honourable friend, the Member for Seven Oaks a question. What is the difference between that particular gentleman and his neighbour, whose wife is already in a personal care home.

**MR. MILLER:** The difference is this, Mr. Chairman. The difference is that before one goes into a personal care home, there's a time period. One knows that one is going to be faced with that. The only announcement was a sudden announcement of an event, of a decision, to apply a fee. Usually one has to wait to get into a personal care home, you can wait five, six, seven, eight, nine months. Adjustments can be made in living conditions, or in this particular case, an application could be made to MHRC to adjust the rent which this man is paying on a rent geared to income, based on the fact that he is a single person, who although he and his wife may jointly be getting cheques, in fact they are living apart and you can't consider them a family unit. Now you can't consider that jointly they are getting \$510 a month and then charge the woman \$210 and the man \$132 for rent only, that's the point. So the Minister is right. If this was something that was known two or three months ago, there was a lead time involved, they could make their adjustment accordingly and make application for a reduction in rent or some other accommodation for the man that's living on his own. But there was no time here. And suddenly he gets a bill, I don't blame him, he was upset, very concerned, he himself happens to have a heart condition, and he just didn't know where to turn. He was fearful that they were going to turn her out of the hospital.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that I am concerned about the point he has raised and I would appreciate the information as to the individual. But I want to assure him that the individual can apply to MHRC right now and could, in fact, have applied as soon as he was so advised by the hospital. —(Interjection)— He got it today? Well, my first advice would be, and if he wants the help of my department in the application,

that he apply without delay to MHRC to have his category readjusted with respect to his rent. But I would like to have the information from the honourable member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, we've been discussing the question of the cutbacks in hospitals and I think that perhaps in some ways the best way of detailing the program is to get away from the more generalized and somewhat abstract discussion of what this 2.9 and 2.2 mean, and get down to some specific cases of where there has actually been substantial hardship or substantial confusion created as a result of the government's strict and apparently unbending attitude. I think in some cases it's led to a fair degree of — let's put it politely — a little bit of rope skipping, I guess, in terms of trying to evade issues which they should be more directly dealing with.

I would start off, first, Mr. Speaker, by coming back to an issue which received some public attention and that was the whole dialysis unit at the Health Sciences Centre, where press reports that appeared a month or so ago indicated that the condition and state of the dialysis unit at the Health Sciences Centre was filthy and that it was filled with all kinds of dirt, insects, etc., and all of a sudden there was some public outcry and it was indicated that there was to be money allocated, I think it was \$300,000 for the construction of a new unit in the laundry facility at the Health Sciences Centre.

Mr. Chairman, I've got a whole range of correspondence that's been exchanged between the Minister, between the Kidney Foundation, between Mr. Swerhone, head of the hospital, which all indicates that as the situation now stands, the only way there's going to be a new dialysis unit is if the Kidney Foundation pays for it. Mr. Swerhone says, and I would quote, after a meeting, that "the only way in which there can now be any new dialysis unit is if the Kidney Foundation purchases at a cost of \$425,000; a new building that the Health Services Commission would then, on their alternative to buy a building, that the Kidney Foundation would then have to undertake the alterations at a cost of \$300,000, or that the Kidney Foundation would make a grant to the Health Sciences Centre for a new unit for which they would pay \$250,000 over ten years. That's all very nice, Mr. Chairman, except the Kidney Foundation doesn't have any money.

So somehow or other, in this whole sort of shuffle over the question of a dialysis unit, if anyone argues that it's needed, certainly the conditions of the existing unit are awful and I think the Minister himself confessed to that, somehow the \$300,000 that appeared has somehow disappeared. It's been suggested that something be done with the Shriner's Children's Hospital, but now we're told that's going to be used for the care of children, which is a worthy cause, so where the situation now stands is that no one has absolutely any idea as to exactly what's going to be done to create a better facility and program for kidney dialysis. The Kidney Foundation is totally confused, it seems the Health Science Centre is confused, and I presume maybe the government is confused. The money has disappeared and in the meantime nothing is being done.

So Mr. Chairman, it is one example, and I will bring up others as we go along, but it is the first example I think that the Minister has to recognize in terms of the problems that are being created by this kind of budgetary regime that he has put things under, that he's forcing the hospitals to resort to a number of sort of tricks, of budgetary manipulations in order to kind of keep afloat and basically to try a number of handy legerdemains of accounting and of fairly fast talking in order to avoid having to live up to certain responsibilities, and that is simply a function that they don't have the money to properly cope with the kinds of demands that are being placed on them. So they're going to have to resort to these kinds of games of illusion in order to survive. Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister should recognize that the more we continue on this particular jaunt that we're on, the more we're going to have to resort to sort of smoke and mirrors in order to try to survive, that the budget is unrealistic, they're putting unrealistic strictures upon the hospitals, and therefore the hospitals are having to revert to these kinds of games of chance and of fast talking in order to simply keep one hand not knowing what the other hand is doing. There is a clear example and a clear indication of the sort of consequences of this kind of budget regime, this austerity regime that he's talking about.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman that the Minister would recognize that it's not a matter that you can keep putting out fires. Each one of these comes along, I presume there'll be some sort of answer for it, and they'll say, I'll deal with it but there will be no answer as long as this particular budget restraint is held at the limit that it's held at, because there is no recourse other than to black magic in order to try to survive or to stay afloat, and that's exactly the position he's putting the hospitals in.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to either ignore the positions that have been legitimately

put by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, or to foreclose the debate on the hospital situation and their budgets but certainly it has been, I think, that subject has been thoroughly aired and thoroughly debated over a period of approximately 12 hours now, and I don't know what other responses or what other explanations I can give other than I've already given and that are on the record over the debates of the last three days.

On the subject of the dialysis unit, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that the situation there is not a result of the government's restraint program or the 2.9 percent increase in the actual hospital program budget which, as I pointed out the other night, is not all the money that the hospitals have been getting because of the deficit adjustments and the adjustments to their base, which they all know about and which will be dealt with in the course of the next few weeks as we examine the responses that they are sending in to us now to their budgets and to the global budget and to the 2.9 percent increase, and as they lay out for us their proposals as to how they intend to re-allocate their funds.

The money for the dialysis unit to the extent of something slightly in excess of \$300,000 is in the Capital budget, it was in the Throne Speech, and can be provided tomorrow. We've had difficulties in achieving a resolution of precisely where the Health Sciences Centre wants that dialysis unit to go, we had approved their choice and their request for conversion of the third floor of the laundry building on Emily Street and provided for the funds requested in the Capital budget this year, and so stated in the Throne Speech. Since that time, I agree with the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, there seems to have been some stumbling blocks put in the way, but the whole question is going to the Health Services Commission on the 27th of this month for their recommendation, and I want to assure the honourable member that the government intends to act very swiftly once it receives a recommendation from the Commission this month.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister a follow-through question on that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated there will be a meeting, I believe he said the 27th of June. Can the Minister indicate exactly who will be involved in making that decision? Will the Hospital Services Commission be involving the Kidney Foundation which has a direct interest in the self-help unit, because as matters now stand, I think it's fair to say that they are totally confused as to exactly, where the unit may be, which sort of program they should be expected to support or endorse, and it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that clarification of this particular item, perhaps even now, would be of some help, at least in terms of communication so that there would be, the lack of anxiety that is now being expressed and has been expressed to me because they simply don't know if anything will be done or who is to do it and there doesn't seem to have been any indication that they would be involved in these discussions. It seems to me there has been a mix-up and certainly a change in the site and what does concern me is that if that one site that was selected and approved is no longer available and a new site has to be found, it may require more money or additional funds to do it because it may be that that \$300,000 just doesn't fit. And therefore I would really want to know from the Minister, if the commitment is still there, are they prepared to match it up with the appropriate dollars to get at the suitable site?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I forgot the honourable member's reference to the Kidney Foundation. There was, apparently, or there appeared to be a very strong chance a few weeks ago that the Kidney Foundation was going to participate to a very substantial degree in the project, and provide a good deal of the funding, a significant amount of the funding, perhaps something even approximating the entire amount. But evidently that hope did not materialize, the prospects fell through. The Kidney Foundation, I'm informed by the Health Sciences Centre and the Health Services Commission, is no longer participating at that level, and so we are back to the original proposal that was approved by Cabinet of the Emily Street laundry building to the funding degree of something slightly in excess of \$300,000, plus two or three other proposals, two or three other new suggestions, modified proposals that have been developed by the Health Sciences Centre and the Health Sciences Centre Board, itself, all of which involve different locations and all of which involve different sums of money and most of which, as the honourable member implies, involve more money than was set aside for the original project.

As a consequence, the Health Sciences Centre is going to be distilling those proposals or recommendations into three or four or whatever workable number of distinct recommendations and they will be going to the Health Services Commission for its adjudication. The Kidney Foundation, to my knowledge, will not participate in that process. There will be, hopefully, a recommendation

that will come forward from the Health Services Commission and its Chairman, Mr. Edwards, to me, and I will then take it the next step to my Cabinet colleagues, and at that point — well, I suppose at this point it's hypothetical to speculate as to whether additional funds will be required because the recommendation may well be, stick with the Emily Street building and the \$308,000.00.

If it's something other than that, well then we'll have to make a determination, based on how much money is involved, because the amount budgeted for is the amount that I've specified.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clarify this. It is part of my understanding that the Emily Street site that was originally proposed has been committed by the Health Sciences Centre for another use, for something dealing with obstetrics and gynaecology for a new research unit, or experimental unit that would be going in there. So it seems that that option has itself been foreclosed. So it appears that we may be in a position where you're looking at new options which would be more expensive, and I think it would be of some assurance if the Minister didn't put a hypothetical quotation around it but in fact indicated that because a commitment was made that the 'unit would be forthcoming within the parameters of those new expenditures he's going to have to face if the Emily Street site has already been spoken for.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that what the honourable member suggests is probably true, although I've had no official word from either the Health Sciences Centre or the Health Services Commission to that effect. But I would suspect that the Health Sciences Centre's enthusiasm for going ahead with the Emily Street site must have been cooled off by something. There must be another option that appeals to them, or another use or possible potential use of that property that appears to be more attractive to them. But I haven't had that officially communicated to me. I would like to have the facts put in front of the Commission board and then have the board present those facts and their concluding recommendation to me. If I were to say to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge right now that I could give an undertaking to the committee that yes, we could go to a certain amount more money, even within ballpark figures, it would be, I think, imprudent, because nobody has yet advised, certainly not persuaded and not even advised the Minister that the Emily Street site is not available.

If the Health Sciences Centre comes to me and says, "Look, we have already played a card that is now not recoverable and that's gone," then that's a different thing. But if they haven't done that and I stand up here in the House tonight and say we are prepared to go to additional funding, then I am foreclosing the course of action that the Executive Council has already agreed upon. So I can't give him that kind of undertaking, but all I can say to him is that I want that Dialysis Unit and I want it in place, and I want it under way in July.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, we have discovered a problem in the per diem of \$7.00 per day for patients panelled for nursing homes. The Member for Seven Oaks has just brought to the Minister's attention a case where there is hardship because of this per diem. I brought a case to the attention of the Minister — I'm not sure whether it was Monday — Monday evening. The situation there was perhaps just as grave or maybe more so, I'm not sure. The lady involved advised me over the weekend that her husband had been panelled, and the per diem — she received a letter sometime in May. I tried to get that information from the Minister as to when the advice went out to the family for the payment. I wasn't able to get a reply on that. But the lady advised me that her husband was receiving the senior citizen's pension with a supplement and she received a notice that they would have to pay \$7.00 a day, which I guess for May would be \$217, as the Member for Seven Oaks has indicated. The wife is not 60 years old. She is not receiving, as I understand it, a spouse but there was a \$130 Canada Pension Plan which was coming in. So it appears to me, from the information that I have received from this lady, that the total income was \$380.00.

Now, this family also has recently purchased housing under the RANCOM Program and I presume that 25 percent, or whatever the amount is of the total income, would go towards payments on the house. It is a purchased house through the RANCOM Program which would be, I suppose, in the neighbourhood of \$100 per month.

Now, this leaves a total of \$280, presuming that the payment on the house is \$100.00. She has advised that she had to pay the per diem. She went in at the end of May, last week, to pay the per diem for the month of May, and she paid that and she was immediately informed that she had to pay for June. So she was faced with the May payment, in addition she was requested to pay in advance for the month of June.

Now, this obviously has put her in a very difficult situation. She was trying to take in babysitting to try and raise additional income but that was a kind of hit-and-miss affair, as far as I could

I certainly will be interviewing this lady over the weekend to find out just what the hardships are but it is obvious here that the policy of this government is going to create a lot of problems for some citizens in our province.

So I think that the fact that the Member for Seven Oaks has brought another case to the attention of the Minister and I brought one on Monday indicates that there obviously has been a problem created by this policy.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come back to some of the other issues related to hospital programming and construction. There is another specific event and that has to do with the disposition of the Shriners Hospital itself. There was an announcement made last summer by the previous Minister, who is in close proximity, that the Shriners Hospital would be turned into a rehabilitation centre for children, a commitment was made of funds on behalf of the Provincial Government and I believe there was a reciprocal commitment by the Shriners themselves to put additional funds up for research and for equipment and other services that would go along with it.

Again, there seems to have been virtually no movement or development in this field. There seems to be a substantial need in this area of a rehabilitation centre for children and particularly following the Minister's own guidelines that he wants to encourage participation and partnership of private organizations and voluntary organizations. This would seem to be a natural opportunity for the government to continue its invitation to private sources to match funds and to get involved in the health and social science field, and yet the hospitals really, at this point in time are in a state of limbo. No one is really too sure what it will be used for, or how it will be used, or where it is going, and no direction is being given or it seems any planning is being done. At least there has been nothing done publicly. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, again here is an opportunity that is being lost or at least is being frozen at a time when there is a demand and where, if we are not careful, we may lose the opportunity provided by the proposed participation of private sources.

So I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to give us an update as to whether the Provincial Government intends to proceed with the development of the Shriners Hospital into a rehabilitation centre for children, and whether the Shriners invitation to be involved in a partnership way is still one that they accept and will use, and I wonder if he can give us some time on it as to when he intends, or at least would hope to intend, to bring this particular project to fruition.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have taken some steps and initiatives with respect to resolution of the future of the former Shriners Hospital, now the Rehabilitation Hospital for Children.

We have set up two committees. One is a management committee or advisory committee that includes personnel with experience in that field, including personnel formerly associated with — well, still associated with the Shrine and formerly associated with the operation of the hospital when it was the Shriners Hospital, and a medical advisory committee that involves persons who, in specific instances, are specially qualified in children's medicine and children's rehabilitative medical work, including a well-known specialist in that field from the Health Sciences Centre.

The Medical Advisory Committee is now actively looking for a medical director for the hospital. The desire is to find a person who is an expert in rehabilitative medicine and I'm told that that search is progressing well and it is reaching the point where it is being narrowed down to the point where we hope we will have a candidate very shortly.

The prosthetic lab, which is of course reputed far and wide in western Canada, is still in operation. The prosthetic and orthopaedic laboratory work is still being done there and it has been our view that regardless of what the final use or disposition of the hospital should be and there are a number of possibilities that have been considered for it, ranging from straight rehabilitation in the children's field to a possible psychiatric bed facility, to other uses — that the prosthetic lab must, at all costs, be preserved. It is an excellent facility and, as I say, widely recognized certainly across western Canada and certainly the government has no intention of permitting any kind of solution, or any kind of direction, that would involve the phasing out of that lab.

It might well be that, depending on the final decision made, that the lab might be located in another facility, although I am not suggesting that that's going to happen. It is desirable, in my view, to leave it where it is. But in any event, that laboratory will continue to be in existence.

Once we have the, sort of, final reports and recommendations from the two committees in operation, the Advisory Board and the Medical Advisory Committee, we will make a determination as to the future use of that site and facility.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that explanation. What he omitted from,

including that, was how much money is being committed to the operation of the hospital and the lab, and whether it is contained within this budget item and this line budget. Can he indicate exactly what is the final commitment being made presently by the Provincial Government to the maintenance of the Shriners Hospital and the lab devices, and what kind of commitments will be made in the future?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is included in the Hospital Program budget appropriation being requested in the Legislature. The amount is approximately \$800,000 a year to fund the operations of the facility and the lab.

I can't give him a future projection until we determine the future role of the hospital but it is certainly being maintained at a necessary level of maintenance and quality, from the point of view of the safekeeping of the facility and the proper operation of the lab.

I just wanted to add, Mr. Chairman, there are about 10 or 12 in-patients in the hospital, , of cours being cared for in the same manner as they were before.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairman.

One of the facilities that I would like, again, some information on, while we are sort of traversing the map of what should or might be done in the area of improving facilities, I don't think I need to repeat the extended history of discussions that related to the proposal of the Misericordia Hospital. I would assume that the Minister has had that matter brought to his attention by some of his caucus members.

What does concern me at this stage, Mr. Chairman, is that there has been an absence, kind of an awesome silence from the Minister lately about the disposition of Misericordia Hospital. One can only assume that that silence indicates that the status quo will be retained. Now, what does concern me is that if that is to be the situation, then the reasons for the renovation of the Misericordia, which is substantial wings of the hospital were considered to be unsafe with dangers of fire and other things, there seems to be no indication from the government that they are prepared to correct or redress that situation. But in their attempt to, I think, work again some sort of exchange or replacement transfer with that of the Seven Oaks Hospital and the reaction that caused back on that, saying, "Let's not do it," and there was a proper and I think legitimate outcry from the community and from elected members in that area — the Member for Wolseley was enjoined in that, as I myself was — the latest indication I have is that nothing is being done at all. But in the meantime, the previous condition exists and that is that there are parts of Misericordia Hospital that could lately be considered to be unsafe and the government has made no commitment to provide any, as I understand it, any funds to redress that situation. So we may be in one of those unfortunate circumstances where we are allowing a deteriorating situation to continue, while someone is making up their mind as to what to do. And I would think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should be very clear as to if Misericordia is to stay where it is and continue providing hospital service in the central area, then I think that prudence would require, even under austerity conditions, that some allocation be made to bring those wings of the hospital up to proper standards, and not to have any safety risks at all attached to it. And I would hope that the Minister would be able to give some answer, if not now, very soon in that direction.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the awesome silence that the honourable member refers to is not so much a result of having made a determination that any translation of the Misericordia facility to the Seven Oaks site is impossible, as it is a reflection of the Executive Council's workload in preparing for the present Session and the necessity to face budgetary decisions that consumed the Cabinet's full time for a considerable period of the year.

The situation at Seven Oaks is that construction is proceeding on schedule, or would be proceeding on schedule if it weren't for the construction strike, and that the architects have received instructions to revise their drawings in order to accommodate a larger bed total, should the government decide to exercise the option before reaching the point of no return in construction, to go to a larger configuration. I well appreciate what the Member for Fort Rouge says about the time - expired aspect of part of the Misericordia plant. There is a great deal of money involved though, and I think to a certain extent probably the government, and particularly I, myself, have been remiss. When we talk about spending and we talk about Capital programs and we talk about downstream costs and we talk about what the government is doing and is not doing in the health care field, we've frequently referred to the \$12.2 million Capital budget for this year, and have never said very much about the Seven Oaks Hospital. The fact of the matter is, I'm sure, as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge knows, that it would have been possible — I'm not saying desirable, but it would have been possible — for the new government to have made the decision not to proceed with Seven Oaks. There would have been some costs involved, certainly, but it would have been possible to make that decision. But we didn't make that decision; we decided to proceed with it,

and that's a \$32 million Capital project, with annual operating costs of approximately \$17.1 million a year. The annual operating costs of the Misericordia are about \$16 million a year, and one of the most widely promoted and most, sort of enthusiastically supported renovation or rebuilding proposals for the Misericordia was going to involve Capital expenditures of \$26 million a year.

Now, I know that there are other plans for the Misericordia. I'm not saying one would have to spend \$26 million, but the two-tower concept that was proposed that I know the honourable member is familiar with would have been a project requiring roughly that amount of Capital expenditure. So we're looking at big sums of money here, and the basic argument for even exploring the option of moving the Misericordia to the Seven Oaks site was that we would wind up with a new Misericordia Hospital on the Seven Oaks site that would have cost \$32 million or \$33 million to build and would cost \$17 million a year to operate, but we would be escaping the \$16 million annual operating costs that currently exist for the Misericordia. —(Interjection)—

So measured in those terms — there were proposals for enriched senior citizens' housing, for a personal care home, for an ambulatory out-p; atient emergency centre yes, there were proposals for use of that property, but if one were to go the whole route and say, we're going to move, translate the whole Misericordia over to the Seven Oaks site and that property's going to be used for something else entirely, you'd be looking at the figures that I've given the honourable member. —(Interjection)— There were approximately 200 beds coming out of the Health Sciences Centre, yes, to go to Seven Oaks.

So those really were the mathematics. And the government simply wanted to explore that option as a viable, reasonable option. We felt that it would have been irresponsible of the government not to explore that possible option. We haven't made the decision to proceed with it because of the impact to which the honourable member has referred; because of some response we've had from the medical profession and the medical staff at the Misericordia, response from the community and the hospital staff itself, and many of the patients who belong to family practices of physicians who practise at the Misericordia, and it's just not been a decision that we've been able to resolve yet in the most humanistic terms, which is the way we would like to do it. It's going to be tough whatever we do, because if we don't do anything, we're faced with the challenge and the responsibility that the honourable member refers to with respect to upgrading the existing Misericordia plant.

But the decision simply hasn't been made yet, Mr. Chairman, and I don't expect it will be made until later this summer. The options are still open, the Seven Oaks facility could be, at this point, expanded to 405 beds without too much additional expense. The additional capital cost would be approximately \$2 million to \$3 million, but it would be far more economic to do it now than to try to do it five years from now. So we're still working our way through that labyrinth.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, on this specific issue, I can sympathize and accept the Minister's problem in terms of trying to figure out what should be done in terms of the new facilities, and I think I can accept that it was necessary to look at the trade-off between Seven Oaks and Misericordia. The point I'm trying to make at this stage is that we have an existing situation where there is reputed to be — I've been told by staff at the hospital the reasons for the original proposal at Misericordia is because the plant facilities there were basically becoming unsafe. That hospital has within it, patients, people, and I don't think we should be assuming that somehow those conditions are going to go away by themselves. They will deteriorate and get worse, and it would seem to me that the kind of open-ended commitment —(Interjection)— I wonder if it may be allowed to continue, Mr. Chairman.

**MR.. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** That if the open-ended proposition that we hear tonight is, yes, something will be done but I'm not sure when, where or how, and that in the list of priorities it doesn't seem to be very high the meantime, the state of limbo that Misericordia is in continues, perhaps with some dangers attached to it. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister and the Health Services Commission apply themselves a little bit more directly to what they intend to do, and at least to perhaps commit the capital to Misericordia to upgrade its existing wings, perhaps without making any grandiose plans for major expansion, but at least to bring it up to safety standards to give it an extended life for another five, ten years, while the government is making up its mind as to what to do with the other hospital situations.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that overall, these are not the kind of decisions that the Minister is outlining are not snap decisions. They are very difficult planning decisions about the overall location and placement of hospital beds and facilities throughout the whole city of Winnipeg and where they're going to attach to growth regions. I will not take the Minister's time, because obviously other members here are anxious to get home to watch the evening news, —(Interjection)— whatever, whatever reason

you want to get home early, you have your own forms of entertainment. But the fact of the matter is that that kind of planning will take a fair amount of time, I would not want the government to make snap decisions on it, so to defer any change or any improvement in Misericordia is going to take a lot of time, and that deferment will then allow those conditions to continue. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the only logical and reasonable course of action at this stage is to make a commitment to at least bring existing conditions at Misericordia up to the proper standard, to give it an extended life for whatever the period may be, another five or ten years; when that planning is taking place, then you can make legitimate decisions about alternative uses in the meantime.

But I would think he would be making a serious, serious mistake to allow the situation just to stay in suspended animation without any direction at all, while this long-term planning is going on. And I would urge the Minister, frankly urge him very seriously, to make that kind of commitment, to go to his colleagues and say, look, we have to do something now, we can't defer that particular extension or renovation.

I'm sure it can be done. I know that capital may be short but we are probably only talking in terms of a few million dollars to bring it up to standards without major expansion, and that should be done post-haste.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, just one question to the Minister. I wanted to clarify, if I heard him correctly in his answer to the Member for Seven Oaks, that he mentioned that the pensioner's wife was now in a hospital, panelled, and that no longer constituted total family income. Did I understand correctly that now the family income was no longer the two pensions but only the one, and that would be the criteria for the 25 percent or whatever the criteria was for the rental payments? Because that is important. That's what I understood the Minister to reply.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Chairman. The way I understood the exchange was that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks suggested that. What I said was that I would like to have the information from the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and I would certainly — my initial suggestion would be that the approach be made to MHRC and to the senior citizens' housing authority to reclassify the category of the husband, because although their combined income has remained the same, there now is \$210 a month going to the personal care home per diem charge, so that really his disposable income position has changed and that should be made known to MHRC and his category should be adjusted so that the rent he pays would be adjusted.

#### DECISION RE MOTION — ROOM 254

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is a motion on the floor which you are not aware of, but which I wish to make you aware of. There is a motion on the floor that committee rise, and I would therefore suggest that that takes precedence at the present time, that there be a vote taken on the motion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

**MR. STEEN:** Mr. Chairman, the Committee of Supply sitting in Room 254 has requested a count-out on the motion by the Honourable Member for Brandon East that the committee rise. The committee in Room 254 has recessed and returned to this Chamber to allow that vote to take place. Would you put the question?

**QUESTION put, MOTION lost.**

**MR. EVANS:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Call in the members. We are in the middle of a motion and a vote.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the results being as follow:  
Yeas 16; Nays 24.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I declare the motion defeated.

(3)—pass; (4)—pass; (5)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, on the Pharmacare, I just have a question of the Minister. There was a formulary issued every year indicating the prices to the druggist, to the pharmacists. Those prices included both the generic drugs as well as the name drugs and the druggist was required to fill the prescriptions using the lowest priced generic drug or, in any case, he couldn't charge more than the lowest priced generic drug. Is that formulary still being issued regularly? Is that the intention because, as I recall, there were tenders or invitations, and prices were requested annually and there were some small adjustments from year to year, depending on the pharmaceutical firms and how they wanted to bid.

It was because of the Pharmacare Program and the Therapeutic Committee — I understand it was the Therapeutic Committee and the formulary itself — that prescription drugs dropped dramatically in Manitoba and I'm wondering whether the formulary is being kept up-to-date and the pricing is being kept up-to-date so that Manitoba can achieve the best prices.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, before the committee proceeds, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge didn't vote one way or other on the resolution that just went before the committee. I wonder how we could deal with that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, I don't know how to deal with it. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The Drug Standards Committee is working on a new formulary, Mr. Chairman. The answer to the honourable member is yes, the normulary system is still in effect. There have been, certainly, some suggested changes and the Drug Standards Committee is at work on development of an updated formulary.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (5)—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I understand that there has been quite a number of senior citizens that were receiving their drugs, had a medical card to receive their drugs. I understand there is a substantial number that have been removed. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many have lost their medical cards to obtain their drugs and I would like also if the Minister could tell us how many of those who have been removed from receiving these drugs are appealing? How many appeals has he received?

I have brought one case to the Minister's attention and I have sent him all the documentation, but I haven't had a reply yet. I presume that he is looking into the matter.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that question was dealt with in statistical detail under Resolution No. 61, Income Security Programs and Health Services, in which I delivered the committee a full report on the total of Social Allowances Health Services card holders — the numbers that had been reviewed thus far, the numbers that had been reissued, the number of cases in which cash was paid which was not paid before, and the numbers that had been appealed and the disposition of those appeals. That's all in the transcript of the Committee hearings of about four or five days ago, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (5)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister a few weeks ago, I think, was referring to the commitment of the First Minister stating that there had been a commitment from the party that dentures, hearing aids and eyeglasses for the elderly citizens will have to be covered under Pharmacare. Is it the intention to do this this year? Is there any money in there that we're voting that will cover that for this year or is that something to come?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Sir, there's nothing in the budget this year. We wanted to hold the deductible at \$50.00 and there's nothing in the budget this year for those extra provisions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (5)—pass. (6)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** On the Pharmacare item, the Minister may have dealt with this before but I have

received several pieces of correspondence from senior citizens who had their program cancelled, you know, whatever, I can't remember the name of it offhand — the Health Guard Program was cancelled. Now if I recall when I raised the matter with the Minister in question period he indicated that there would be provision under the Pharmacare Program to absorb or deal with this problem, and he may have dealt with it before but I may not have been in the House. I wonder if he could give a clear definitive answer on this issue — exactly what steps should be taken by those senior citizens in order to acquire the same kinds of supports for their prescriptions and so forth under this program. Do they follow the normal Pharmacare arrangement where they still have to go through the \$50.00 up front costs and that there is no special provision for transition for them in this area. I have several letters on file, I'd be glad to give them to the Minister, indicating that they feel that it's going to be a hardship, I was wondering how the Minister intends to deal with it through the Pharmacare program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I would appreciate if the honourable member would give me those letters, Mr. Chairman. We, as I've said a minute ago in response to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, we did deal pretty extensively under Resolution 61 with the whole Health Services, Social Allowances Health Services card program under Income Security and I gave a fairly detailed statistical information on the status of that whole review at that time and it's in the transcript of the Committee hearings of about last Thursday, last Thursday evening. The 2,700 cases have been reviewed, or approximately 2,100 of them have been reviewed and some of them have gone to appeal to the Social Services Advisory Committee, and I was asked at the time, I think by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and assured him and can assure the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that even if one does not succeed in one's appeal and the appeal judgments are based on eligibility criteria, income and asset eligibility criteria, they can still ask for a further review and further consideration. We will not refuse, and my office will not refuse to reconsider or re-examine any person who thinks they have a special case or are suffering any hardship, so I would be interested in receiving that file from the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Aside from that the answer to his question is that there is no up front provision. If it is deemed that they have moved through income, whether it's pension income or whatever, beyond the eligibility limits they then turn to the Pharmacare program and they would deal with it and it would respond to them in the same way as it does to anyone. They would purchase their drugs. Their \$50.00 deductible, of course, would be something that they would have to pay. Eighty percent of all expense beyond that is paid for by the people of Manitoba and they receive that in the form of a refund. They get their receipts from their pharmacist and then apply for their refund.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I think that clarifies the general state of affairs. I was interested in whether the Minister, going back to a statement I believe he made in the House — we could check Hansard when I originally asked the question. The issue arose back in March at some point — that there might be some adjustment on the Pharmacare program for those who were under the Health Card system, whether it was a waiving of the \$50.00 deductible or not — I wasn't sure what he had in mind at that time because he didn't spell it out. But I'm wondering for those senior citizens who were under the Health Card Program who are now having to make the transition — I think as he indicated it is a transitional phase — whether there is any inclination to waive the \$50.00 deductible in order to sort of offset some of those who have expressed concerns, real concerns, about the fact that this will impose an added burden on their income. I believe, Mr. Chairman — I don't have the file with me, I'm sorry, it's in my office — that some feel that because there is a time lag in applications for old age supplements and so on, that the added burden of all of a sudden having now to buy their drugs and so on under the Pharmacare program where there is the \$50.00 deductible will mean that will not be adjusted in their income until several months down the track through the supplement program, so there will be a loss of income incurred as a result of having to make that transition. So I was wondering if there would be an inclination to provide some offset to that in this particular circumstance.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that the government ever contemplated waiving the \$50.00 deductible in any case. In fact I'm absolutely positive the government never contemplated it. If I gave the honourable member that impression then I was certainly in error. I don't recall that I did because this comes as a new suggestion to me that we should have contemplated waiving the \$50.00 deductible. What I did say, I think, or certainly what I meant to say was that no doubt there are cases of genuine, legitimate hardship and I want to assure the honourable member that I've instructed that cases be dealt with individually and judged on their individual merits and approached from the point of view of particular individual hardship, and that the rules should be

bent where he in his compassion, or anybody else in this House in their compassion, would suggest that it was excusable to bend them.

On the other hand one has to try to be fair. When you get into that kind of mix you invite unforeseen difficulties and the general rule is that the criteria are being applied on the basis of income, and if a person through pension or whatever has moved beyond that eligibility then the sort of basic position that the department is taking is that their card should probably be withdrawn. But if they feel there going to be caused any particular difficulty by it they should ask to have it reviewed by the Social Services Advisory Board.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (6)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Is (6) Ambulance? Would you mind naming the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (6) Ambulance program—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** My only question on that, Mr. Chairman. It's the same amount. That's the grant to the municipality, it's not the northern ambulance and it's exactly the same amount as last year. Does that mean that this will be in the way of a reduction, or the municipality will have to pay the — I know that this is just a grant, not a specific commitment to pay anything; it's up to a certain amount. But no provision has been made for inflation that's on here, and is it the intention to just give exactly the same grant and let the municipality pick up whatever in excess they might have to pay for their programs?

**MR. SHERMAN:** It's the same amount, Mr. Chairman, and the municipalities would be responsible for picking up any difference. The last time the per capita grants were increased was in 1976 and that was an increase of 10 percent over 1975. There haven't been any further increases since 1976 and there is no increase this year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (6)—pass; (7) Northern Patient Transportation Program—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, is this exactly the same policy and the same program that was announced after the task force or committee met and the recommendations were made on the action of the former government? I see that's about the amount that was suggested. This was approved. There's no change in policy at all.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (7)—pass; (8) Other Health Services Programs—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** What I want to say is to remind the Minister, because we were discussing this at an earlier time and we mentioned — I think we were talking about the elderly — and the Minister had stated that there was no money in the past and I said there had been and that I'd find it for him, and there it is, it's under this. That was for the Youville Foundation.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (8)—pass; Clause 8—pass. Resolution 64: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$444,692,000 for Health and Social Development, Manitoba Health Services Commission, \$444,692,000—pass.

Resolution 65, Clause 9: Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to try to deal with that, I have some questions. I notice the amount shown here is \$398,000 compared to \$3,506,000 last year. The Minister of Finance distributed a sheet to the House a couple of weeks ago indicating that in addition to the \$398,000 showing here, it's anticipated, or it's a fact that they will spend \$405,800.00. Can the Minister tell us personally that is the amount that's not being asked for here, but rather that the government is availing itself of the authority voted in 1977-78? It's a capital authority under Schedule B voted in 1977-78, and so that the actual amount the government will be spending is \$398,000 plus \$405,000, which is close to a million dollars — or \$800,000 — and I was wondering if the Minister could (a) confirm that and (b) could he tell us what the \$405,800 is going to cover? What it's for?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I might have to take that question as notice, those two questions as notice, and get the information for the honourable member for tomorrow. I don't have it at my fingertips and I thought I had it with me, Mr. Chairman, but I'm not sure that I have. I wonder if I could give him that information tomorrow?

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, when he's getting that information could he also advise whether there's any other capital requirement required or any other drawdown on Schedule B capital, beyond the \$405,800 which he indicates for 1978-79?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, I can get that information. I believe the answer to that question is "no," but I don't want to swear by it. I can get that information and have it for the honourable member tomorrow.

**MR. MILLER:** The Health leader is leaving the House. In light of the fact that the Minister hasn't got the information now and isn't prepared to give it tonight, he'll have it tomorrow' I am wondering whether we can adjourn now because, depending on the answer we get, there may be a number of questions arising on this particular item. On the other hand, if the Minister had the information, we might have cleared it, but because it isn't here we really can't discuss it with any meaning.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The same thing can be done on the Minister's Salary, if my honourable friend is prepared to do that. Committee rise.

*The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.*

#### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House Adjourned until 10 a.m. Friday morning.